

Corporate and Community Services Department

Council Headquarters, Eastwood Park, Giffnock, East Renfrewshire, G46 6UG

Phone: 0141 577 3000 Fax: 0141 577 3834

website: www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Date: 8 February 2019

When calling please ask for: Paul O'Neil (Tel No. 0141 577 3011)

e-mail:- paul.o'neil@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

TO: Councillors A Ireland (Chair), B Cunningham (Vice Chair), A Convery, J Fletcher,
J McLean, S Miller and J Swift.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY

A meeting of the Local Review Body will be held in the Council Chamber, Council Headquarters, Eastwood Park, Giffnock on **Wednesday, 13 February 2019 at 2.30pm or if later at the conclusion of the Planning Applications Committee which begins at 2.00pm.**

The agenda of business is as shown below.

Caroline Innes

C INNES

DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

AGENDA

1. Report apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of interest.
3. Notice of Review – Review 2019/01 – Formation of Driveway incorporating reduction in Height of Boundary Wall – Report by Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached, pages 3 - 110).

This document can be explained to you in other languages and can be provided in alternative formats such as large print and Braille. For further information, please contact Customer First on 0141 577 3001 or email customerservices@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

BLANK PAGE

EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCILLOCAL REVIEW BODY13 February 2019Report by Deputy Chief ExecutiveREVIEW OF CASE - REVIEW/2019/01FORMATION OF DRIVEWAY INCORPORATING REDUCTION IN GROUND LEVELSAND REDUCTION IN HEIGHT OF BOUNDARY WALLAT 29 EAST KILBRIDE ROAD, BUSBY**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of the report is to present the information currently available to allow a review of the decision taken by officers, in terms of the Scheme of Delegation made in terms of Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended by the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006 in respect of the application detailed below.

DETAILS OF APPLICATION

2. Application type: Full Planning Permission (Ref No:- 2018/0691/TP).
- Applicant: Mr Paolo Di Mambro.
- Proposal: Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and reduction in height of boundary wall.
- Location: 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby.
- Council Area/Ward: Clarkston, Netherlee and Williamwood (Ward 4).

REASON FOR REQUESTING REVIEW

3. The applicant has requested a review on the grounds that the Council's Appointed Officer refused the application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

4. The Local Review Body is asked to:-
- (a) consider whether it has sufficient information to allow it to proceed to determine the review without further procedure and, if so, that:-
- (i) it proceeds to determine whether the decision taken in respect of the application under review should be upheld, reversed or varied; and
- (ii) in the event that the decision is reversed or varied, the reasons and the detailed conditions to be attached to the decision letter are agreed.

- (b) In the event that further procedure is required to allow it to determine the review, consider:-
 - (i) what further information is required, which parties are to be asked to provide the information and the date by which this is to be provided; and/or;
 - (ii) what procedure or combination of procedures are to be followed in determining the review.

BACKGROUND

5. At the meeting of the Council on 29 April 2009, consideration was given to a report by the Director of Environment seeking the adoption of a new Scheme of Delegation in terms of the new Section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, subject to approval of the scheme by Scottish Ministers.

6. The report provided details of the new hierarchy of developments that took effect from 6 April 2009 explaining that the Scheme of Delegation related to those applications within the “local development” category as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Hierarchy of Development) (Scotland) Regulations 2009, but would in future be determined by an “appointed officer”. In the Council’s case this would be either the Director of Environment or the Head of Roads, Planning and Transportation Service now designated the Head of Environment (Strategic Services).

7. The report highlighted that historically appeals against planning decisions were dealt with by Scottish Ministers. However, following the introduction of the new planning provisions which came into effect on 3 August 2009 all appeals against decisions made in respect of local developments under delegated powers would be heard by a Local Review Body. The Local Review Body would also deal with cases where the appointed officer had failed to determine an application within two months from the date it was lodged.

NOTICE OF REVIEW – STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR REQUIRING THE REVIEW

8. The applicant in submitting the review has stated the reasons for requiring the review of the determination of the application. A copy of the applicant’s Notice of Review and Statement of Reasons is attached as Appendix 5.

9. The applicant is entitled to state a preference for the procedure (or combination of procedures) to be followed by the Local Review Body in the determination of the review and has indicated that his stated preference is the assessment of the review documents only, with no further procedure.

10. The Local Review Body is not bound to accede to the applicant’s request as to how it will determine the review and will itself decide what procedure will be used in this regard.

11. However, at the meeting of the Local Review Body on 10 August 2016, it was decided that the Local Review Body would carry out unaccompanied site inspections for every review case it received prior to the cases being given initial consideration at a meeting of the Local Review Body.

12. In accordance with the above decision, the Local Review Body will carry out an unaccompanied site inspection on Wednesday, 13 February 2019 immediately before the meeting of the Local Review Body which begins at 2.30pm.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO ALLOW REVIEW OF APPLICATION

13. Section 43B of the Planning etc (Scotland) Act 2006 restricts the ability of parties to introduce new material at the review stage. The Local Review Body is advised that the focus of the review should, therefore, be on the material which was before the officer who dealt with the application under the Scheme of Delegation.

14. The information detailed below is appended to this report to assist the Local Review Body in carrying out the review of the decision taken by the Appointed Officer:-

- (a) Application for planning permission – Appendix 1 (Pages 7 - 14);
- (b) Copies of Objections/Representations – Appendix 2 (Pages 15 - 50);
- (c) Report of Handling by the planning officer under the Scheme of Delegation - Appendix 3 (Pages 51 - 58);
- (d) Decision notice and reasons for refusal - Appendix 4 (Pages 59 - 62); and
- (d) A copy of the applicant's Notice of Review and Statement of Reasons - Appendix 5 (Pages 63 - 100).

15. The applicant has also submitted the drawings listed below (available for inspection within the Planning Division of the Environment Department prior to the meeting and for reference at the meeting) and these are attached as Appendix 6 (Pages 101 - 110).

- (a) Ground Level and Height;
- (b) Visibility Splay of Driveway;
- (c) Other Visibility Splay;
- (d) Plan;
- (e) Visibility Splay 46 metres to left and 45 metres to right;
- (f) Refused – Location Plan
- (g) Refused – Plan; and
- (h) Refused – Driveway levels.

16. The Local Review Body is advised that initial consultation responses and representations received if any, relating to the application will be listed in the planning officer's Report of Handling.

17. All the documents referred to in this report can be viewed online on the Council's website at www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk with the exception of any representations that have been made to the application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

18. The Local Review Body is asked to:-

- (a) consider whether it has sufficient information to allow it to proceed to determine the review without further procedure and, if so, that:-
 - (i) it proceeds to determine whether the decisions taken in respect of the application under review should be upheld, reversed or varied; and
 - (ii) in the event that the decision is reversed or varied, the reasons and the detailed conditions to be attached to the decision letter are agreed.

- (b) In the event that further procedure is required to allow it to determine the review, consider:-
 - (i) what further information is required, which parties are to be asked to provide the information and the date by which this is to be provided; and/or;
 - (ii) what procedure or combination of procedures are to be followed in determining the review.

Report Author: Paul O'Neil

Director - Caroline Innes, Deputy Chief Executive

Paul O'Neil, Committee Services Officer
e-mail: paul.o'neil@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk
Tel: 0141 577 3011

Date:- February 2019

**APPLICATION
FOR
PLANNING PERMISSION**

BLANK PAGE



2 Spiersbridge Way Thornliebank G46 8NG Tel: 0141 577 3001 Email: planning@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100142873-001

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

Description of Proposal

Please describe accurately the work proposed: * (Max 500 characters)

Take the 1.4M boundary wall along east kilbride road. Reduce it to 50CM and take 10M away and rebuild 5M 60CM further back also at height of 50CM. Leave an opening of 5M with gully. Take the boundary fence at the side joining the pavement and remove it entirely. So there is a 2M run of pavement along the front which keeps the pavement uniform at 2M. Reduce the height internally to accommodate a lower gradient.

Has the work already been started and/ or completed? *

No Yes - Started Yes – Completed

Please state date of completion, or if not completed, the start date (dd/mm/yyyy): *

01/02/2018

Please explain why work has taken place in advance of making this application: *
(Max 500 characters)

I mis-read the permitted development rights. This being a classified road you need planning permission to do these works.

Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? * (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

Applicant Agent

Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	<input type="text" value="Paolo"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="29"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text" value="Di Mambro"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="East Kilbride RD"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>	Town/City: *	<input type="text" value="Glasgow"/>
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	<input type="text" value="Scotland"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	<input type="text" value="G76 8JY"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text" value="REDACTED"/>		

Site Address Details

Planning Authority:

Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):

Address 1:

Address 2:

Address 3:

Address 4:

Address 5:

Town/City/Settlement:

Post Code:

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing	<input type="text" value="656517"/>	Easting	<input type="text" value="258177"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------

Pre-Application Discussion

Have you discussed your proposal with the planning authority? *

Yes No

Pre-Application Discussion Details Cont.

In what format was the feedback given? *

Meeting Telephone Letter Email

Please provide a description of the feedback you were given and the name of the officer who provided this feedback. If a processing agreement [note 1] is currently in place or if you are currently discussing a processing agreement with the planning authority, please provide details of this. (This will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently.) * (max 500 characters)

LRB required me to present the application again with the verification of the boundary fence.

Title:

Mr

Other title:

Mr

First Name:

Paolo

Last Name:

Di Mambro

Correspondence Reference Number:

2018/0385/TP

Date (dd/mm/yyyy):

07/11/2018

Note 1. A Processing agreement involves setting out the key stages involved in determining a planning application, identifying what information is required and from whom and setting timescales for the delivery of various stages of the process.

Trees

Are there any trees on or adjacent to the application site? *

Yes No

If yes, please mark on your drawings any trees, known protected trees and their canopy spread close to the proposal site and indicate if any are to be cut back or felled.

Access and Parking

Are you proposing a new or altered vehicle access to or from a public road? *

Yes No

If yes, please describe and show on your drawings the position of any existing, altered or new access points, highlighting the changes you proposed to make. You should also show existing footpaths and note if there will be any impact on these.

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) currently exist on the application site? *

0

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) do you propose on the site (i.e. the total of existing and any new spaces or a reduced number of spaces)? *

3

Please show on your drawings the position of existing and proposed parking spaces and identify if these are for the use of particular types of vehicles (e.g. parking for disabled people, coaches, HGV vehicles, cycle spaces).

Planning Service Employee/Elected Member Interest

Is the applicant, or the applicant's spouse/partner, either a member of staff within the planning service or an elected member of the planning authority? *

Yes No

Certificates and Notices

CERTIFICATE AND NOTICE UNDER REGULATION 15 – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (SCOTLAND) REGULATION 2013

One Certificate must be completed and submitted along with the application form. This is most usually Certificate A, Form 1, Certificate B, Certificate C or Certificate E.

Are you/the applicant the sole owner of ALL the land? *

Yes No

Is any of the land part of an agricultural holding? *

Yes No

Certificate Required

The following Land Ownership Certificate is required to complete this section of the proposal:

Certificate A

Land Ownership Certificate

Certificate and Notice under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Certificate A

I hereby certify that –

(1) - No person other than myself/the applicant was an owner (Any person who, in respect of any part of the land, is the owner or is the lessee under a lease thereof of which not less than 7 years remain unexpired.) of any part of the land to which the application relates at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the accompanying application.

(2) - None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of an agricultural holding

Signed: Mr Paolo Di Mambro

On behalf of:

Date: 07/11/2018

Please tick here to certify this Certificate. *

Checklist – Application for Householder Application

Please take a few moments to complete the following checklist in order to ensure that you have provided all the necessary information in support of your application. Failure to submit sufficient information with your application may result in your application being deemed invalid. The planning authority will not start processing your application until it is valid.

- a) Have you provided a written description of the development to which it relates? * Yes No
- b) Have you provided the postal address of the land to which the development relates, or if the land in question has no postal address, a description of the location of the land? * Yes No
- c) Have you provided the name and address of the applicant and, where an agent is acting on behalf of the applicant, the name and address of that agent? * Yes No
- d) Have you provided a location plan sufficient to identify the land to which it relates showing the situation of the land in relation to the locality and in particular in relation to neighbouring land? *. This should have a north point and be drawn to an identified scale. Yes No
- e) Have you provided a certificate of ownership? * Yes No
- f) Have you provided the fee payable under the Fees Regulations? * Yes No
- g) Have you provided any other plans as necessary? * Yes No

Continued on the next page

A copy of the other plans and drawings or information necessary to describe the proposals (two must be selected). *

You can attach these electronic documents later in the process.

- Existing and Proposed elevations.
- Existing and proposed floor plans.
- Cross sections.
- Site layout plan/Block plans (including access).
- Roof plan.
- Photographs and/or photomontages.

Additional Surveys – for example a tree survey or habitat survey may be needed. In some instances you may need to submit a survey about the structural condition of the existing house or outbuilding. Yes No

A Supporting Statement – you may wish to provide additional background information or justification for your Proposal. This can be helpful and you should provide this in a single statement. This can be combined with a Design Statement if required. * Yes No

You must submit a fee with your application. Your application will not be able to be validated until the appropriate fee has been Received by the planning authority.

Declare – For Householder Application

I, the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for planning permission as described in this form and the accompanying Plans/drawings and additional information.

Declaration Name: Mr Paolo Di Mambro

Declaration Date: 07/11/2018

Payment Details

Telephone Payment Reference [REDACTED]

Created: 07/11/2018 16:11

COPIES OF OBJECTIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

BLANK PAGE

**Roads Service
OBSERVATIONS ON
PLANNING APPLICATION**

Our Ref: 2018/0691/TP
D.C Ref Derek Scott
Contact: Malcolm Matheson
Tel: 0141-577-8431

Planning Application No: 2018/0691/TP **Dated:** 08/11/18 **Received:** 15/11/18
Applicant: Mr Paolo Di Mambro
Proposed Development: Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and erection of boundary wall
Location: 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby, G76 8JY
Type of Consent: Full Planning Permission
Ref No. of Dwg.(s) submitted: As per Idox

RECOMMENDATION **Refusal**

Proposals Acceptable Y/N or N/A Proposals Acceptable Y/N or N/A Proposals Acceptable Y/N or N/A

1. General

(a) General principle of development	Y
(b) Safety Audit Required	N
(c) Traffic Impact Analysis Required	N

2. Existing Roads

(a) Type of Connection (junction / footway crossing)	N
(b) Location(s) of Connection(s)	N
(c) Pedestrian Provision	N/A
(d) Sightlines	N

3. New Roads

(a) Widths	N/A
(b) Pedestrian Provision	N/A
(c) Layout (horizontal/vertical alignment)	N/A
(d) Turning Facilities (Circles / hammerhead)	N/A
(e) Junction Details (locations / radii / sightlines)	N/A
(f) Provision for P.U. services	N/A

4. Servicing & Car Parking

(a) Drainage	N
(b) Car Parking Provision	N
(c) Layout of parking bays / Garages	N
(d) Servicing Arrangements/Driveways	N

5. Signing

(a) Location	N/A
(b) Illumination	N/A

Ref.	Reasons for Refusal
	<p>In the interest of road safety this Service has no option but to refuse this application.</p> <p>The proposed development, if permitted, would involve the construction of a new vehicular access onto the A727 East Kilbride Road where visibility is severely restricted by the road's existing horizontal alignment and would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to road safety.</p> <p>The installation of a new access on to the A727 East Kilbride Road would result in the manoeuvring of vehicles on the adjoining road, taking access to or from the site, to the detriment of road safety.</p>

	Comments
1(a)	<p>It is understood that there is a proposed reduction in the height of the fence at the site's western boundary. Despite the reduction in fence height the applicant cannot meet the required visibility splay in this direction. It should also be noted that the visibility splay should not cross private land. Roads comments regarding previous application 2018/0385/TP are still relevant.</p> <p>It is noted that the applicant decided to withdraw a previous planning application for the formation of a driveway at the same location – Planning application 2018/0102/TP.</p>
2(a & b)	<p>The proposal is to form a new vehicular access on to the A727 for the property at 29 East Kilbride Road. The property sits in the apex of a triangle formed by the Glasgow to East Kilbride railway line to the northeast and the A727 district distributor road (East Kilbride Road) to the southwest, which carries in excess of 19,000 vehicles per day (as per Traffic Survey – 3606-SCO East Kilbride Road, Busby).</p> <p>Given its unusual location, no vehicular access to the property currently exists and Cleansing advise that they do not service the property from East Kilbride Road.</p>

Controller (M&O)	N/A	Date		by	
VC letter	N/A	Date		by	

DEV File Ref	N/A	Date		by	
CC File Ref	N/A	Date		by	

2(d)	<p>The location being proposed for the new access lies west of a low bridge (signed 4.2m / 13'9" clearance) which carries the Glasgow to East Kilbride railway line. Northwest bound traffic approaching the bridge has to negotiate a left hand bend which restricts forward visibility to the site and adversely affects the achievable secondary direction visibility splay of the proposed access.</p> <p>Due to the horizontal and vertical profile of the road, there is a double white line system installed on this section of the A727 from its junction with the B759 Carmunnock Road to a point 45 metres southeast of its junction with The Paddock. It should be noted that there are no other accesses to individual dwellings along this double white lined section of road or indeed, for some length thereafter.</p> <p>Fronting the site and over most of the length of the double white line system, there is a 'no waiting/no loading at any time restriction with sections of 'no waiting; 8am – 6pm; Monday to Friday' over the lengths of road opposite the site and Carmunnock Road.</p> <p>Immediately northwest of the proposed access, and thus adversely impacting the primary direction visibility splay, is an existing lighting column (R9) and a bus stop with associated infrastructure including a bus shelter and a 'no waiting' bus stop marking.</p> <p>If permitted the proposal would introduce right turn vehicular movements into and out of the site which would lead to an increased probability of rear end shunts as vehicles stop to execute a right turn into the site or, when executing a right turn out of the site, interfere with free flow traffic on the A727.</p> <p>The required visibility for a 30mph road is 2.5m x 90m in both the primary and secondary directions with no interference allowed within the splay above a height of 1.05m. This can clearly not be achieved at the location being proposed for the new access. This is shown within Drawing no. 900 where the visibility in the primary direction is significant less than required. It should be noted that the visibility splays here should be measured to the edge of the nearside carriageway.</p> <p>For the secondary direction the shown 2.5 x 80m visibility splay is through private land which the applicant has no control over.</p> <p>Drawing no. 904 shows other junctions / accesses within the Busby area. It is noted that the visibility splays are incorrect as they have not been taken from the correct points. For example the visibility splay for the A727 East Kilbride Road / B759 Carmunnock Road has not been measured from the existing give way line, and 65 East Kilbride Road's driveway junction has not been measured from the edge of the kerb which separates the carriageway from the footway.</p> <p>The applicant must under the terms of The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, apply to this Service for a Section 56 'Road Opening Permit' to carry out the proposed works.</p> <p>As evidenced above, this Service clearly has a number of road safety concerns with regard to this proposal and has no option therefore, but to recommend refusal.</p>
------	---

Notes for Intimation to Applicant:

(i) Construction Consent (S21)*	Not Required
(ii) Road Bond (S17)*	Not Required
(iii) Road Opening Permit (S56)*	Required

* Relevant Section of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984

Comments Authorised By: John Marley
pp Environmental Services Manager

Date: 08.01.19

2018/0691/TP. (DS)

33 PRINTERSLAND

G76 8HP.

26th November 2018.

Dear Sir/Madam,

For the vast 25 years I have resided at 33 Printersland, for the last 25 years there has been a problem which the water department has attended on several occasions with excess water running down past Printersland on East Kilbride road. The heavier the rain the worse the problem.

I feel lowering the ground level would add to this problem. Also so far the poor standard of workmanship in 29 East Kilbride road which has been done so far I feel it would cause further problems.

My view from the window was once a beautiful picturesque woodland scene, now it is a pathetic dump.

As previously stated I think the formation of a driveway would cause danger as the only foot path from the main road and the railway runs along that side of the road.

In the last two years there have been several accidents at

The bridge traffic is already congested in East Kilbride road and further exiting of ~~at~~ vehicles would bring traffic to a standstill.


The residents of Printerland have already been subjected to enough upset with the unprofessional way the changes that happened on 29. E.K. road took place.

I have already previously sent you this evidence but if necessary can prove it again.

The children supposed to walk under a dark railway bridge which is the only foot path on one side of the road and risk getting knocked down on a blind corner.

Please accept my comments and if you require any further information please contact me.

Thank you



removed the wall
with your permission.

O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 04 February 2019 09:45
To: Nicol, Julie; O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW 2019/01

Please see below objection to above review, he has sent 8 other emails with photos etc, if you need me to forward these on to you please let me know.

Thanks
Carla

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:27
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW 2019/01

To whom it may concern The owner of 29 EK road does not have any facilities for loading or unloading How can he possibly do the alterations without heavy goods vehicles blocking the Eastkilbride road at a very bad bend The residents of PrintersLand have been subjected to enough upset and will tolerate no more We have been advised to call Police Scotland if our cars are blocked in again or he sets the rubbish on fire again and emergency services have to be called The alterations that were done to the property without permission were accessed via PrintersLand This indeed will not be tolerated a second time I hope you understand my reasoning and I strongly object to the formation of a dangerous driveway causing further drainage and and road problems Thank you Philomena McConnell

Sent from my iPhone

BLANK PAGE

O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:17
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW/2019/01

Hi Paul,

Email from Mr McConnell, there is another 11 emails.

Thanks
Carla

From: Peter McConnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 12:55
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW/2019/01

To whom it may concern I would like you to take into consideration my initial letter of objection I will resubmit with more comments to follow

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peter McConnell [REDACTED]
Date: 26 November 2018 at 14:30:38 GMT
To: planning@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk
Subject: 29 Eastkilbride Rd

33 PRINTERSLAND

G76 8HP
26th November 2018.

Dear Sir/Madam,

For the vast 25 years I have resided at 33 Printersland, for the last 25 years there has been a problem which the water department has attended on several occasions with excess water running down East Printersland on East Kilbride road. The heavier the rain the worse the problem.

I feel lowering the ground level would add to this problem. Also so far the poor standard of workmanship in 29 East Kilbride road which has been done so far I feel it would cause further problems.

My view from the window was once a beautiful picturesque woodland scene, now it is a pathetic dump. As previously stated.

Sent from my iPhone

O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:17
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW 2019/01

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 12:57
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW 2019/01

Page 2 of initial objection From P McConnell

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Date: 26 November 2018 at 14:31:47 GMT
To: planning@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk
Subject: 29 East Kilbride rd

The bridge traffic is already congested in East Kibride road and further exiting of ~~the~~ vehicles would bring traffic to a standstill.

The residents of Printerstand have already been subjected to enough upset with the unprofessional way the changes that happened wh. E.K. road took place. I have already previously sent you this evidence but if necessary can prove it again.

Are children supposed to walk under a dark railway bridge which is the only foot path on one side of the road and risk getting knocked down on a blind corner.

Please accept my comments and if you require any further information please

Sent from my iPhone

O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:17
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: Review 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4384.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:01
To: EN Planning
Subject: Review 2019/01

[REDACTED]



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:17
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: Review 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4406.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:03
To: EN Planning
Subject: Review 2019/01

[REDACTED]



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: Review 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4496.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:05
To: EN Planning
Subject: Review 2019/01

My perimeter fence had been removed without my permission I also had to further stop the attempt to demolish the whole perimeter fence without my permission



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW
Attachments: IMG_4499.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:07
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW

[REDACTED]



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4546.PNG; ATT00001.txt; IMG_4548.PNG; ATT00002.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:16
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW 2019/01

We needed intervention from our MP

BLANK PAGE

Done

Printers Land signed.pdf



The Scottish Parliament
Parlaiment na h-Alba

Jackson Cartow MSP
Member for Eastwood

Mr Andrew Cahill
Director of Environment
East Renfrewshire Council
7 Spiersbridge Way
Spiersbridge Business Park
Thornliebank
G46 8NG

17th April 2018

Dear Andrew 

Unauthorised changes and other disturbances at Printers Land, Busby, Clarkston, G76 8HP

I have been contacted by a concerned constituent regarding unauthorised changes that have been made to the grounds at the Printers Land residential area in Busby alongside other disturbances by a new neighbour.

I have been advised that it is a matter causing some consternation to residents many of whom are elderly.

I will relay the matter as it has been expressed to me.

As I understand it the individual concerned has been blocking residents' vehicles and also a footpath with large cement trucks and tractors. The result of this has been that some residents have been unable to move their cars and enter their properties.

I am told that a long standing wall has been taken down and that on Easter Monday, an attempt was made to demolish a perimeter fence that has been maintained by residents for approximately three decades.

I have been made aware that the new neighbour has been making unauthorised alterations to the structure and layout of the road to the dismay of those inhabiting Printers Land.

Some of the other disturbances include high levels of smoke that has required the emergency services to make a visit to the area; logs and debris being dumped on communal garden areas; and the removal of trees inhabited by a protected species.

Done

Printers Land signed.pdf



Tel: 0131 348 6800 email: jackson.carlaw.msp@parliament.scot

It is my understanding that planning consent has not been sought for the changes that would normally require prior approval from East Renfrewshire Council before action could be taken although the individual concerned has now submitted an application for planning permission to construct a driveway following contact from council officers.


It has been relayed to me that many of the households at Printers Land are deeply dissatisfied by the ongoing situation and the unauthorised changes that have been made to their place of residence.

The matter has caused a great deal of discomfort to residents who are feeling less secure and comfortable in their homes.

It would be very much appreciated if a planning officer could inform me of the council's own investigation into the matter and outline what steps are being taken to redress the outstanding issues.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,



Jackson Carlaw MSP
Deputy Leader of the Scottish Conservatives
Shadow Cabinet Secretary for Europe & External Affairs
Member of the Scottish Parliament for Eastwood

F: [@JacksonEastwood](https://twitter.com/JacksonEastwood)
T: [@CarlawEastwood](https://twitter.com/CarlawEastwood)
W: www.jacksoncarlaw.org.uk

O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4512.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:13
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW 2019/01

Wall already knocked down without permission



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW 2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4513.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:14
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW 2019/01

Entrance already in use from EK Rd



O'Neil, Paul [CE]

From: EN Planning
Sent: 05 February 2019 10:18
To: O'Neil, Paul [CE]
Subject: FW: REVIEW/2019/01
Attachments: IMG_4552.JPG; ATT00001.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Mcconnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2019 13:35
To: EN Planning
Subject: REVIEW/2019/01

The entrance was already used as a driveway from EK road to bring in Vans [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



idoxsoftware@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

From: idoxsoftware@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk
Sent: Wed, 28 Nov 2018 18:59:51 +0000
To: EN Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 2018/0691/TP

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 6:57 PM on 28 Nov 2018 from Miss Alicia Di Mambro.

Application Summary

Address: 29 East Kilbride Road Busby East Renfrewshire G76 8JY
Proposal: Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and reduction in height of boundary wall
Case Officer: Mr Derek Scott

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Miss Alicia Di Mambro
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: 60 Castleton Drive, Newton Mearns, East Renfrewshire G77 5LE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public
Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:

Comments: While Paul may advice me not to register a comment I thought i should and simply reference a section of Designing streets. If this guidance is followed we would not have the roads department issuing figures for roads and bridges not suitable for a residential area. I support the application as it follows current guidance for residential areas and not old figures not researched that the roads department issued in the consultation for planning application 2018/0385/TP.

Quote :
Page 4 Designing streets:

Reference should no longer be made to road hierarchies based on terminology such as local distributor/local access roads.

This is saying if you go to page 4 and also see the diagram where it is to be used that all roads with residential context should be classed as streets regardless of use to ensure safety and the visibility within the document should be used. Which is 60CM by 2.4M by 43M in a 30MPH road. If you look at the figures

provided by the roads department you see that in a residential area they miss vital pedestrians and as such their visibility splay is deficient. Why the Scottish government does not guide using them in a residential area. The point of a visibility splay is to declare a safe visibility to see everything in it's path. Not possible when you cant see children. Why on this instance Designing streets is far safer and the roads department needs to look at its figures.

Alicia Di Mambro
60 Castleton Drive
Glasgow
G77 5LE

Review/2019/01
ref 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby
Formation of driveway

25/01/2019

Now I wish to go to the point I wish to make which was my original representation. The applicability of the horizontal visibility splay in designing streets.

I enclose the exert from the National road development guide page 17.

Much of the research utilised in the preparation of Designing Streets is based on the stopping sight distance (SSD) at locations with traffic speeds of less than 40 mph. Similarly, in rural areas many parts of the road network are subject to the national speed limit but have traffic speeds significantly below 60 mph. Generally, in these situations where speeds are lower than 40 mph, evidenced by examination of the 85th percentile, the parameters used in Designing Streets are appropriate.

The parameters used in designing street are appropriate. I think that in not an interpretation but a legally based fact which given these are national documents have high standing in law. It is saying if you know the 85% speed Designing streets should be used in a residential area with speeds under 40MPH.

The issue before the councillors is the visibility in Designing streets safe. Which is the visibility the drive way has. I would like to also add how does a road being existing or new change the braking distance of a car. The friction co-efficient for the road surface given both are made of asphalt does not enter into the equation. For visibility splay. The road speed, the drivers observation time, the drivers reaction time and the cars braking system have a bearing. So other cars and road's age does not.

Designing streets has in its descriptions road limiters, moving houses closer to the road, having parked cars at the side of the road, narrow the road down and more. All measures to give a perception of danger. This perception is enough to slow the motorist down. So that the 85% speed of the road can be accurate. The section the house is in has a natural speed limiter which does this. The 85% speed is 28.7MPH

and 29.8MPH in a heat wave. So we can be sure the 85% speed is under the 30MPH of the road and the visibility splay given by Paul for the drive way meets this.

Therefore the point the drive way was refused on horizontal road layout is proven wrong by the visibility splay in Designing streets as well as every other drive on East Kilbride road which says the proposal has enough visibility splay. This I hope can be seen as not the interpretation but use of simple logic by reading Designing street and the national road development guide plus the speed data and looking at East Kilbride road where no house has 90M either side not planning application **2016/0286/TP 65 East Kilbride road for a new drive way onto east Kilbride road and 2017/0717/TP for the house at the light opposite called busby hotel for a drive widening which visibility hits the traffic lights.** The section on East Kilbride road does not need redesigned. It has a constant, verifiable and accurate 85% which is less than 30MPH. So Designing streets figures of 60CM by 43M by 2.4M are applicable as confirmed by the national road development guide page 17. The drive way has more visibility splay as horizontally it has 45M once Paul and Mr Adams move the items required. I see nothing wrong with this proposal and a lot of gain in respect to local context. It widens the pavement enhancing pavement safety and certainly is more wheelchair and pedestrian friendly, removes parking tension by having all cars for the house removed to the house and creates a driveway that fits in with the national guidance. I ask the councillors to consider that the drive way meets and surpasses the horizontal visibility splay in the national documents for road safety which are the National road development guide and designing streets.

I fully support this proposal.

Thank you for you time,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Alicia Di Mambro.

Alicia Di Mambro.

I would ask the council to end the 14 Days time frame for my representations as I will not be making a further representation after this and if possible would like to have this meet the February local review body meeting.


Paul Di Mambro
 29 East Kilbride road
 Glasgow
 G77 5LE

Review/2019/01
 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby, East Renfrewshire
 Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground level and reduction in height of boundary wall
 5/02/2019

I agree with Alicia and would like to make further representation on her point as I feel I have not mentioned it and it needs emphasised. The roads excuse for ignoring national guidance is wrong. The statement in the National road development guide is clear and does not require interpretation. The 85 percentile has nothing to do with the age of the road but the actual measured speed. The statement does not ask for age but speed to be verified. The parameters it asks to be set are below and on page 33 of Designing streets.

I enclose the exert from the National road development guide page 17.

Much of the research utilised in the preparation of Designing Streets is based on the stopping sight distance (SSD) at locations with traffic speeds of less than 40 mph. Similarly, in rural areas many parts of the road network are subject to the national speed limit but have traffic speeds significantly below 60 mph. Generally, in these situations where speeds are lower than 40 mph, evidenced by examination of the 85th percentile, **the parameters used in Designing Streets are appropriate.**



Page 33 of Designing streets

The 85% speed is 28.7MPH Westbound and 29.8MPH Eastbound. The figure that is appropriate given the 85% speed was checked and verified is 60CM vertical, 43M Horizontal and recessed 2.4M. All met and surpassed. The National documents would fully support my visibility splay. These are not documents that should be ignored given the research that went into creating them. Evolving the knowledge of road design beyond that of the old figures the road department are using.

I have provided as proof of the 85 percentile speed. Therefore the reason my drive was refused which is horizontal road alignment can be verified as wrong as the figure that should be used is 43M not 90M. The bus stop opposite my drive for right turns is safe as I explained in my supporting statement. I hope the councillors can be confident that I meet all criteria's for a safe drive way and as such I would ask the councillors to grant my application.

BLANK PAGE

REPORT OF HANDLING

BLANK PAGE

REPORT OF HANDLING

Reference: 2018/0691/TP

Date Registered: 8th November 2018

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

This application is a Local Development

Ward: 4 -Clarkston, Netherlee And Williamwood

Co-ordinates: 258177/:656517

Applicant/Agent: Applicant: Agent:

Mr Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
East Renfrewshire
G76 8JY

Proposal: Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and reduction in height of boundary wall

Location: 29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G76 8JY

CONSULTATIONS/COMMENTS:

East Renfrewshire Council Roads Service

Recommends refusal on the grounds of public road safety.

PUBLICITY: None.

SITE NOTICES: None.

SITE HISTORY:

2018/0102/TP	Formation of driveway	Withdrawn	16.05.2018
2018/0299/TP	Erection of two storey rear extension	Refused	06.07.2018
2018/0385/TP	Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and erection of boundary wall	Refused Local Review Dismissed	17.09.2018 28.11.2018

REPRESENTATIONS: Two representations have been received in respect of the application of which one objects and the other supports the application. The representations are summarised as follows:

Objection

Detrimental to public road safety
Surface water run-off
Visual impact.

In support

A visibility splay of 2.4 metres by 43 metres with no obstruction over 0.6 metre should be used.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN & GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE: See Appendix 1

SUPPORTING REPORTS:

Speed data measurements of traffic on East Kilbride Road – Data gathered by applicant outside 29 East Kilbride Road on 4/6/2018.

Drawing 904 – Visibility splays for Easter Road, B759 and 65 East Kilbride Road.

Supporting Statement – Outlines the applicant's view as to why the proposed access would be safe. It includes a statement on the removal of part of the boundary fence and indicates the applicant's willingness to remove existing infrastructure within the required visibility splay.

ASSESSMENT:

The application site comprises a detached two storey dwelling and its curtilage and lies to the north side of the A727 East Kilbride Road, Busby, within an established residential area. The Glasgow to East Kilbride Railway sits elevated immediately to the east of the site and crosses the A727 East Kilbride Road via an overbridge. The railway overbridge lies 10 metres to the east of the application site. Flatted properties with their maintained common areas lie to the west and north of the site. The A727 is a district distributor road.

The curtilage was until recently characterised by established trees and shrubs although the applicant has cleared the entire site and formed areas of hardstanding. The property has a 1.4 metre high sandstone retaining wall that used to run along the entire frontage of the site with East Kilbride Road. The applicant has partially removed this and re-graded some of the ground in front of the dwelling to the level of the adjacent footway with a view to creating a vehicular access. Having been advised that the formation of an access onto a classified road, as well as the earthworks that have been carried out require planning permission, the applicant ceased work on the formation of the access and positioned large stones to prevent vehicles entering the site. Historically there was no vehicular access to the property. The dwelling is unoccupied having recently been purchased by the applicant.

Planning permission is sought for the formation of driveway incorporating a reduction in ground levels and for the erection of a boundary wall. The access is proposed to be formed 5 metres wide with a dropped kerb at the western-most part of the frontage of the site. The earthworks that have been carried out involve the excavation of soil along the frontage of the site, re-grading the pre-existing ground to form a slope of 9 degrees from the dwelling down to the level of East Kilbride Road. The proposed boundary wall would stand 0.5 metres high and lie 0.6 metres further into the site from the alignment of the existing wall. The remainder of the wall is proposed to be reduced to 0.5 metres in height with the ground behind re-graded. An in-curtilage turning area and two car-parking spaces are proposed.

A similar planning application (2018/0385/TP) for the formation of a driveway incorporating a reduction in ground levels and for the erection of a boundary wall at the site was refused on 17 September 2018. A subsequent review to the Local Review Body (under reference REVIEW/2018/21) was dismissed on 28 November 2018. This current application is differs only in that a section of boundary fence on the western-most boundary of the site has been removed.

The application requires to be assessed against Policy D1 of the adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan. Policy D1 requires that all development should not result in a

significant loss of character to the surrounding area and that the Council's parking and access requirements are met.

It is considered that the visual amenity of the site is relatively poor in comparison the amenity of the surrounding area. However this is due to the fact that the dwelling has been unoccupied and unmaintained for some time and that the applicant has ceased the works. If the application is considered to be acceptable, details of the finish of the driveway and the retaining wall and a landscaping scheme can be submitted for further approval. This would ensure that the development is acceptable in appearance and in keeping with the character and visual amenity of the wider area.

The proposal must now be considered with regard to public road safety. The Council's Roads Service has recommended that the application is refused on the grounds of public road safety. Roads Service advises that the development, if permitted, would involve the construction of a new vehicular access onto the A727 East Kilbride Road where visibility is severely restricted by the existing horizontal alignment of the road and would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to road safety.

The Roads Service further advises that northwest bound traffic approaching the bridge has to negotiate a left hand bend which restricts forward visibility to the site and adversely affects the achievable secondary direction visibility splay of the access.

Due to the horizontal and vertical profile of the road, there is a double white line system installed on this section of the A727 from its junction with the B759 Carmunnock Road to a point 45m southeast of its junction with The Paddock. It should be noted that there are no other accesses to individual dwellings along this double white lined section of road or indeed, for some length thereafter.

The advice from the Roads Service also states that if permitted the proposal would introduce right turn vehicular movements into and out of the site which would lead to an increased probability of rear end shunts as vehicles stop to execute a right turn into the site or, when executing a right turn out of the site, interfere with free flow traffic on the A727.

Notwithstanding the removal of part of the western boundary fence, the Roads Service advises that the required primary visibility splay cannot be achieved at the location of the new access. This is because the required visibility splay is over private land that the applicant does not control. In the secondary direction the visibility splay is also through private land over which the applicant has no control.

The Roads Service therefore has significant roads safety concerns about the proposals. The Council's access requirements cannot therefore be met and the development is therefore contrary to Policy D1 of the adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan.

As noted above, the applicant has submitted a supporting statement and technical data in support of the application. The technical data includes speed measurements taken on East Kilbride Road and examples of visibility splays elsewhere on East Kilbride Road. The supporting statement is the applicant's interpretation of the technical data and reference how he considers it relates it to this proposal and includes a statement on the removal of part of the boundary fence. Supporting drawings showing measurements of the bend on East Kilbride Road as it passes under the railway overbridge, visibility splays at the site and swept path analyses showing vehicles entering and exiting the site have also been submitted. All of this data and the supporting drawings and plans have been considered by the Council's Roads Service prior to providing their consultation response. The supporting statement and technical data are not considered to outweigh Roads Service response.

In relation to the representation in support of the application, which states that a visibility splay of 2.4 metres by 43 metres with no obstruction over 0.60 metre in height, those figures have been extracted from the Scottish Government's Policy Document "Designing Streets". That document relates to the design, construction, adoption and maintenance of new streets. It can also be applicable to existing streets that are subject to redesign. The current application is for the formation of an access onto an existing road which is not subject to a comprehensive redesign. It is therefore considered that Designing Streets has little weight in the determination of this application. The Roads Service is the Planning Authority's consultee on matters relating to public road safety and their advice must be given significant weight. It is not considered that this representation in support should outweigh the comments of the Roads Service for the reasons given above.

The following comment is made in respect of the point of objection not specifically addressed above. If the application is approved, a condition can be attached to any planning permission granted requiring surface water to be contained within the site.

Overall conclusion

The proposal is considered contrary to Policy D1 of the adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan as the proposed access, given its location on a section of East Kilbride Road where visibility is severely restricted by the road's horizontal alignment, would be detrimental to public road safety. There are no material planning considerations that outweighs this policy and allow the application to be approved.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS: None.

REASON FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy D1 of the adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan as the access would be detrimental to public road safety given its location on a section of East Kilbride Road where visibility is severely restricted by the horizontal alignment of the road.

ADDITIONAL NOTES: None.

ADDED VALUE: None

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Further information on background papers can be obtained from Mr Derek Scott on 0141 577 3034.

Ref. No.: 2018/0691/TP
(DESC)

DATE: 9th January 2019

DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT

Reference: 2018/0691/TP - Appendix 1

DEVELOPMENT PLAN:**Strategic Development Plan**

This proposal raises no strategic issues in terms of the Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan and therefore the East Renfrewshire Local Plan is the relevant policy document

Adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan

Policy D1

Detailed Guidance for all Development

Proposals for development should be well designed, sympathetic to the local area and demonstrate that the following criteria have been considered, and, where appropriate, met. In some cases, where the criteria have not been met, a written justification will be required to assist with assessment.

1. The development should not result in a significant loss of character or amenity to the surrounding area;
2. The proposal should be of a size, scale, massing and density that is in keeping with the buildings in the locality and should respect local architecture, building form, design, and materials;
3. The amenity of neighbouring properties should not be adversely affected by unreasonably restricting their sunlight or privacy. Additional guidance on this issue is available in the Daylight and Sunlight Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance;
4. The development should not impact adversely on landscape character or the green network, involve a significant loss of trees or other important landscape, greenspace or biodiversity features;
5. Developments should incorporate green infrastructure including access, landscaping, greenspace, water management and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems at the outset of the design process. Where appropriate, new tree or shrub planting should be incorporated using native species. The physical area of any development covered by impermeable surfaces should be kept to a minimum to assist with flood risk management. Further guidance is contained within the Green Network and Environmental Management Supplementary Planning Guidance;
6. Development should create safe and secure environments that reduce the scope for anti-social behaviour and fear of crime;
7. Developments must be designed to meet disability needs and include provision for disabled access within public areas;
8. The Council will not accept 'backland' development, that is, development without a road frontage;
9. Parking and access requirements of the Council should be met in all development and appropriate mitigation measures should be introduced to minimise the impact of new development. Development should take account of the principles set out in 'Designing Streets';
10. Development should minimise the extent of light pollution caused by street and communal lighting and any floodlighting associated with the development;
11. Developments should include provision for the recycling, storage, collection and composting of waste materials;
12. Where possible, all waste material arising from construction of the development should

- be retained on-site for use as part of the new development;
13. Where applicable, new development should take into account the legacy of former mining activity;
 14. Development should enhance the opportunity for and access to sustainable transportation, including provision for bus infrastructure, and particularly walking and cycle opportunities including cycle parking and provision of facilities such as showers/lockers, all where appropriate. The Council will not support development on railways solums or other development that would remove opportunities to enhance pedestrian and cycle access unless mitigation measures have been demonstrated;
 15. The Council requires the submission of a design statement for national and major developments. Design statements must also be submitted in cases where a local development relates to a site within a conservation area or Category A listed building in line with Planning Advice Note 68: Design Statements.
 16. Where applicable, developers should explore opportunities for the provision of digital infrastructure to new homes and business premises as an integral part of development.

GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE: None

Finalised 09/01/19 AC(3)

**DECISION NOTICE
AND
REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

BLANK PAGE

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997
(AS AMENDED BY THE PLANNING ETC (SCOTLAND) ACT 2006)
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013**

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Ref. No. **2018/0691/TP**

Applicant:

Mr Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
East Renfrewshire
G76 8JY

Agent:

With reference to your application which was registered on 8th November 2018 for planning permission under the abovementioned Act and Regulations for the following development, viz:-

Formation of driveway incorporating reduction in ground levels and reduction in height of boundary wall


at: 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby, East Renfrewshire, G76 8JY

the Council in exercise of their powers under the abovementioned Act and Regulations hereby refuse planning permission for the said development.

The reason(s) for the Council's decision are:-

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy D1 of the adopted East Renfrewshire Local Development Plan as the access would be detrimental to public road safety given its location on a section of East Kilbride Road where visibility is severely restricted by the horizontal alignment of the road.

Dated 9th January 2019



Director of Environment
East Renfrewshire Council
2 Spiersbridge Way,
Spiersbridge Business Park,
Thornliebank,
G46 8NG
Tel. No. 0141 577 3001

The following drawings/plans have been refused

Plan Description	Drawing Number	Drawing Version	Date on Plan
Location Plan	LOCATION		
Plans Proposed	DP-441-001		
Elevations Proposed	DP-441-002	B	

GUIDANCE NOTE FOR REFUSAL OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REVIEW BY EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL'S LOCAL REVIEW BODY

1. If the applicant is aggrieved by a decision to refuse permission (or by an approval subject to conditions), the applicant may require the planning authority to review the case under section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months from the date of this notice. A Notice of Review can be submitted online at www.eplanning.scotland.gov.uk. Please note that beyond the content of the appeal or review forms, **you cannot normally raise new matters** in support of an appeal or review, unless you can demonstrate that the matter could not have been raised before, or that its not being raised before is a consequence of exceptional circumstances. Following submission of the notice, you will receive an acknowledgement letter informing you of the date of the Local Review Body meeting or whether further information is required.

2. If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land's interest in the land in accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

CONTACT DETAILS

**East Renfrewshire Council
Development Management Service
2 Spiersbridge Way,
Spiersbridge Business Park,
Thornliebank,
G46 8NG**

**General Inquiry lines 0141 577 3895 or 0141 577 3878
Email planning@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk**

**NOTICE OF REVIEW
AND
STATEMENT OF REASONS**

BLANK PAGE



2 Spiersbridge Way Thornliebank G46 8NG Tel: 0141 577 3001 Email: planning@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100124763-021

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? * (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

Applicant Agent

Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	<input type="text" value="Paolo"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="29"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text" value="Di Mambro"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="East Kilbride RD"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>	Town/City: *	<input type="text" value="Glasgow"/>
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	<input type="text" value="Scotland"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	<input type="text" value="G76 8JY"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text" value="██"/>		

Site Address Details

Planning Authority:

East Renfrewshire Council

Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):

Address 1:

29 EAST KILBRIDE ROAD

Address 2:

BUSBY

Address 3:

Address 4:

Address 5:

Town/City/Settlement:

GLASGOW

Post Code:

G76 8JY

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing

656517

Easting

258177

Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: *
(Max 500 characters)

Create an pavement in front of 2M for 10M with 5M being at the opening of my driveway and 5M a recessed wall of 40cm.
Remove the entire wall and rebuild the wall with similar material to a height of 90CM. Lower the existing ground and mono block.

Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? *

- Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).
- Application for planning permission in principle.
- Further application.
- Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? *

- Refusal Notice.
- Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: * (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

The planning authority are not following national guidance for visibility splay in a residential area. I will be including a supporting statement

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the Determination on your application was made? *

Yes No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: * (Max 500 characters)

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: * (Max 500 characters)

Speed test of East Kilbride road done during a heat wave in June 2018 as well as the forms submitted with the planning application

Application Details

Please provide details of the application and decision.

What is the application reference number? *

2018/0691/TP

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? *

09/11/2018

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? *

09/01/2019

Review Procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. *

Yes No

In the event that the Local Review Body appointed to consider your application decides to inspect the site, in your opinion:

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? *

Yes No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? *

Yes No

Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant?. *

Yes No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? *

Yes No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? *

Yes No N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? *

Yes No

Note: You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. You may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review *

Yes No

Note: Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice (if any) from the earlier consent.

Declare – Notice of Review

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: Mr Paolo Di Mambro


Declaration Date: 10/01/2019

I would like to add this statement to my planning application with the diagrams inside to confirm each point:


Visibility Splay

Firstly : we have come to a place where roads are applying 2 standards to road safety. The one they applied to the driver way application 2018/0385/TP is unsafe for children of 1.05M which would be common in a residential area and is common on the section of East Kilbride road. This is evident in the vertical height being too high and meaning anything lower than 1.05M which are children to the age of 4-5 years would be missed in this requirement and unreasonably put in danger. Roads needs to revise its guidance.

Secondly : The standard which has been promoted by the Scottish National government in Designing streets is vertically 60CM this ensures all children are caught as a child will be higher than this height at 4 months. Definitely not walking independently. Table from Designing streets below and also how to measure the visibility splay. This is current guidance and best practice to develop a safe visibility splay. Later I will show why not using current guidance and best practice is dangerous. Why my visibility splay is safer than the one provided by the roads department in their consultation.



Solid Double White Line formation at the center line makes it illegal to overtake. You can still cross this into a junction or driveway. There is none close so cars should under any circumstances cross this double white line formation. This means I have a visibility splay of 45M.



X and Y distances

An X distance of 2.4 m should normally be used in most built-up situations, as this represents a reasonable maximum distance between the front of the car and the driver's eye.

A minimum figure of 2 m may be considered in some very lightly-trafficked and slow-speed situations, but using this value will mean that the front of some vehicles will protrude slightly into the running carriageway of the major arm. The ability of drivers and cyclists to see this overhang from a reasonable distance, and to manoeuvre around it without undue difficulty, should be considered.

Using an X distance in excess of 2.4 m is not generally required in built-up areas.

The Y distance should be based on values for SSD.

Thirdly : Despite this anomaly on two different standards it is hard to understand how a drive way can be classed as unsafe due to visibility splay when it surpasses the national guidelines for a drive way in a 30MPH zone. Given Visibility splay is based on road speed which I have tested and is fully known how can the road being existing or under construction change the reaction time, cars breaking time and observation time. The road can't change these items. Also having a number of cars on the road prior to your car does not affect these parameters. The only thing that can affect the visibility splay is the speed of the car. So given the speed of the road/car is fully known which was done in a speed check it is near impossible to say that the visibility splay which conforms to higher than that guided by Designing streets is unsafe. Unless you are saying that the Scottish government wasted their time and created a dangerous visibility splay. Which would be a ridiculous argument to make. The visibility splay in Designing streets was created with research. The one given by roads in their consultation for planning application 2018/0385/TP was arbitrary figures not backed by any hard facts and as I will show later is dangerous in a residential area. Making my visibility considerably safer as it meets current best practice and safety standards for visibility splay in a 30MPH zone as per Designing streets.

Right Turns

The bus stop opposite my house has a lay by which is 2.5M. This is short of a minimum standard bus stop lay by 1.1M, please see picture on next page. A lay by should allow the whole bus out of the way of traffic. This means that when a bus stops to pick up passengers opposite my house depending on the traffic behind it the bus randomly stops traffic on East Kilbride road. This means that depending on the flow of traffic the bus halts traffic and the next car after the bus will be in the same place as a right turn

into my drive way. This has happened randomly many times over the course of the years. The time it takes for the bus to move off after this event is enough time for the car behind it to take a right turn into my drive way. Why I state randomly through the day cars have been doing right turns into my drive way. Using a web site to check car accidents at this location it was revealed looking back 10 years that 0 accidents occurred while the bus stopped traffic randomly in this period. The road is free flowing and buses randomly impede traffic on an ongoing bases. My drive way being a residential home would have near zero affect on free flowing traffic as are the buses.



Bend is a natural speed limiter

The speed of the cars after the bend at the bridge given the shape of the bend is very slow. The bend has a calculated max speed using mathematical modeling of 25MPH. If you wish to test this in practical terms I would ask you to drive your car round this bend at speeds greater than 25MPH. You will experience side forces causing your tyres to slide despite turning your steering wheel to go round the bend which will make you hit your brakes. If you fail to do so you will see your car move over the double white line formation onto oncoming traffic. This means that people drive slowly round the bend or they brake while going round the bend. Both make this section very safe as a natural speed limiter.

Other sections to note

I would ask you to take a right turn at the B759 a little along East Kilbride Road. This has a visibility splay of about half that proposed by my drive way. When you sit at the junction to execute a right turn over the double white line formation I ask you to appreciate that the visibility splay I offer is more than double this but you, I will assume, will execute the right turn with little or no trouble. It is not really a desirable visibility splay and not in keeping with current guidance but it is not strikingly dangerous. Yet the same section of road should have a visibility splay of over 4 times this at 90M to be safe. Somewhat ridiculous to suggest that 90m is required given the shortness of the visibility splay at the B759. If the section was indeed dangerous under public safety the roads department has a duty to close this junction under public safety. Note when you do this maneuver my drive way has more than double the visibility splay of this junction. I am enclosing a picture on the next page to show the visibility splay.



Number of movements a day

I also wish to note that the number of movements my drive way would execute in a day. For a single family home is in the order of **15** movements a day. This mean that my drive way would have the most **miniscule** effect on East Kilbride road. There has already been 2 approved alterations of a full drive way and enlargement of an openings on East Kilbride road in 2017 and 2016. My drive way has a visibility splay of vertical 60CM which is desirable in a residential area for the protection of children and 2.4M back from the road to allow for a clear view without impeding traffic flow and this stretches to 45M both sides without going over anyone's land. Which is 2M greater than the 43M required at 30MPH that is required in Designing streets and almost 26M greater than the B759. I meet and surpass current safe visibility splay standards and best practice as defined in Designing streets enclosed in the **National Road Development Guide** found on the Scottish governments website.

No parking and wheelchair access,

There is limited parking within the area which can be obtained across the road if the area opposite is not full. The scheme beside mine is Printerland states for residents only. Although of course the argument that in theory parking on private land in Scotland cant be restricted especially as there is no bay allocation or permits but it is unfair to have my cars impose themselves on their area especially when parking there is also full. So there is no parking in the area for the house. For wheel chair access there is no provisions and only a narrow pavement of 1.4M which is restricted by the light column at my house which is wheelchair unfriendly given its narrowness when you take into account the light column. I intend to help the situation by giving 60CM of my land to the pavement and pay for the light column to be moved to a move convenient location. Giving wheelchairs more ability to move along the section. I will be improving pavement safety in the location substantially. Currently I am in good health but I wish it noted that this is not even being considered. That an inhabitant of the house may need to use a wheelchair and all the risk factors of getting across the road and along the narrow pavement with a wheelchair have just been ignored. A house with a visibility splay in keeping with current road safety


guidance and safer in a residential area, than those provided by the roads department, would be reasonable that this drive be accepted.

Infrastructure currently in my visibility splay

Infrastructure at the house which blocks the visibility splay I have had discussions with Mr Adams of road and lighting and he has advised that he is happy to move what is needed as long as I am willing to pay for such a move. This I am more than happy to do and I would be happy to have that as a condition of approval.

Roads visibility splay figures are incompatible with a residential area.

I wish to show with a couple of pictures why this is a residential area and why applying road standards in a residential area is unsafe. Why Designing streets fixes this and why my visibility is safe and fits in with best practice and current safety guidance in the document. During the time the councilors visited my house on the 7th Of November 2018 I recorded their visit as I was advised I could not attend. In this recording a number of people passed but the 2 pictures I am adding are those that children are put in danger from using old figure and wrongly classing the section as a road. It shows how in the 12 minute recording 2 children walked by my house who were under the 1.05M that roads classes as safe. Even though they would be missed out of the drivers visibility and potentially killed. This is in the space of a 12 minute video during the councilors visit. This issue is resolved by following current guidance and Designing streets.



This picture and one on the page opposite both children would be safe with Designing streets and not be in danger as unlike roads figures, Designing streets was created with research. Best practice and current guidance state that to ensure we see these children the vertical visibility splay is set to 60CM not the dangerous 1.05M. Again it also sets a horizontal visibility splay of 43M in a 30MPH zone. So given best practice and current guidance shows my visibility is safe. My drive way should be approved.



Lastly so we can see how in a residential area the figures provided by the roads department for a safe visibility is absolutely absurd of course the horizontal is dangerous but lets now look at the vertical figure of 90M. Few if any Junction or house on East Kilbride road meets this figure not even the ones planing accepted in 2017 and 2016 on East Kilbride Road which were far short of the 90M and even less than the national guidelines. Lets think for a moment though what the figures are. They are saying for a drive way to be safe it needs 90M or equivalent to a football field either side. Of course this is not the case and the figures were arbitrarily chosen not researched and confirmed as was Designing streets which says this should be 43M. Roads have tried to suggest 45M is too short but yet not many junctions or houses on East Kilbride road even come close to my 45M visibility splay. Designing streets would say my drive way is safe as would almost all the junctions and houses which have a drive way visibility splay similar or less than mine with no issues which is most of the Junctions and houses on East Kilbride road. You would be hard pushed to find even one with 90M either side. I meet and surpass the proper researched national guidance on visibility splay called Designing streets.

The Fence which boundaries the pavement and was a concern in the previous local review has been removed under permitted development to allow a 2M section of pavement to run from bus stop area to 10M in front on my house. I am giving 60CM of my land to improve the pavement safety to allow the creation of a 2M pavement as with the light column the pavement goes down to 1.1M before I start to improve the area. 1.1M Pavement is in itself dangerous and not wheelchair friendly or allow more than 1 pedestrian walking together but resolved with my proposal.

My Drive way follows the National Road Development guide and more specifically Designing streets. I meet and surpass current guidance. My drive way is **safe**

I would like to add this statement to my planning review with the diagrams inside to confirm each point but before I do I would like to answer a few points raised by the roads department:

- Firstly** The 2.5 by 90M I will explain in my statement why this is not for a residential area
- Secondly** I have advised the roads department that last review my refuge collection is from Printerland,
- Thirdly** As there is no other access close it surely confirms that any movement out of the drive only needs focus on the road and not have to focus on access to the road by other accesses as well. But no houses exist close by which would be the reason.
- Fourth** I am unsure the 90M over someone's land the road department mentions as my diagrams I presented don't show 90M but 46M and 45M and these don't go over anyone's land, 90M is not required and does not add anything to the safety of a drive way. Every driveway on East Kilbride road and the National road development guide confirms this as I will explain.

Visibility Splay

Firstly : we have come to a place where roads are classing a road with substantial residential context as a road which is not in keeping with the national guidance on road development. The visibility splay the roads department applied to the driver way application is unsafe for children of 1.05M which would be common in a residential area and is common on the section of East Kilbride road. This is evident in the vertical height being too high and meaning anything lower than 1.05M which are children to the age of 4-5 years would be missed in this requirement. Why Designing streets suggests a more appropriate visibility splay in a residential area on all roads, streets, drives etc regardless of traffic flow.

Secondly : Designing streets used in the national road development guide would class East Kilbride road as a street and set a safe vertical visibility of 60CM which ensures all children are seen as a child will be higher than this height at 4 months. Definitely not walking independently. Table from Designing streets below and also how to measure the visibility splay on next page.

This Column


Speed	Kilometers per hour	16	20	24	25	30	32	40	45	48	50	60
	Miles per hour	10	12	15	16	19	20	25	28	30	31	37
	SSD (metres)	9	12	15	16	20	22	31	36	40	43	56
	SSD adjusted for bonnet length	11	14	17	18	23	25	33	39	43	45	59

Visibility requirements


Visibility should be checked at junctions and along the street. Visibility is measured horizontally and vertically.

Using plan views of proposed layouts, checks for visibility in the horizontal plane ensure that views are not obstructed by vertical obstructions.

Checking visibility in the vertical plane is then carried out to ensure that views in the horizontal plane are not compromised by obstructions such as the crest of a hill, or a bridge at a dip in the road ahead. It also takes into account the variation in driver eye height and the height range of obstructions. Eye height is assumed to range from 1.05 m (for car drivers) to 2 m (for lorry drivers). Drivers need to be able to see obstructions 2 m high down to a point 600 mm above the carriageway.



Solid Double White Line formation at the center line makes it illegal to overtake. You can still cross this into a junction or driveway. There is none close so cars should not under any circumstances cross this double white line formation. This means I have a visibility splay of 45M.



X and Y distances

An X distance of 2.4 m should normally be used in most built-up situations, as this represents a reasonable maximum distance between the front of the car and the driver's eye.

A minimum figure of 2 m may be considered in some very lightly-trafficked and slow-speed situations, but using this value will mean that the front of some vehicles will protrude slightly into the running carriageway of the major arm. The ability of drivers and cyclists to see this overhang from a reasonable distance, and to manoeuvre around it without undue difficulty, should be considered.

Using an X distance in excess of 2.4 m is not generally required in built-up areas.

The Y distance should be based on values for SSD.

Thirdly Despite the classification of the section wrongly it is hard to understand how a drive way can be classed as unsafe due to visibility splay when it surpasses the national guidelines for a drive way in a 30MPH zone. Given Visibility splay is based on road speed which I have tested and is fully known how can the road being existing or under construction change the reaction time, cars breaking time and observation time. The road can't change these items. Also having a number of cars on the road prior to your car does not affect these parameters. The only thing that can affect the visibility splay is the speed of the car. So given the speed of the road is fully known which was done in a speed check it is near impossible to say that the visibility splay which conforms to higher than that guided by Designing streets is unsafe. Unless you are saying that the Scottish government wasted their time and created a dangerous visibility splay. Which would be a ridiculous argument to make. The visibility splay in Designing streets was created with research the one given by roads in their consultation was arbitrary figures not backed by any hard facts.

Right Turns

The bus stop opposite my house has a lay by which is 2.5M which is short by 1.1M of a minimum standard bus stop lay by please see picture on next page. A lay by should allow the whole bus out of the way of traffic. This lay by is too narrow to do so. This means that when a bus stops to pick up passengers opposite my house depending on the traffic behind it the bus randomly stops traffic on East Kilbride road. This means that depending on the flow of traffic the bus halts traffic and the next car after the bus will be in the same place as a right turn into my drive way and the time the bus is picking up passengers is enough time for a car to drive into the drive way. This occurs randomly daily on East Kilbride road. Using a web site to check car accidents on the road opposite my house to gauge if this

causes accidents it was revealed looking back 10 years that 0 accidents occurred opposite my house while the bus stopped traffic.



Desirable in designing streets the bend is a natural speed limiter

The speed of the cars after the bend given the shape of the bend is a lot under 25MPH. The bend has a calculated max speed using mathematical modeling of 25MPH. If you wish to test this in practical terms I would ask you to drive your car round this bend at speeds greater than 25MPH. You will experience side forces which will make you hit your brake. If you fail to do so you will see your car move over the double white line formation onto oncoming traffic. This means that people drive slowly round the corner or they brake while going round the corner. Both make this section very safe as a natural speed limiter. In a speed test 50M away from the bend at my drive way it was noted that cars only managed to recover to a speed of 28.7MPH and as this test was done in a heat wave the figure expected to be more 26.2MPH. Cars after a restriction in speed tend to accelerate back to the speed limit which would mean a figure of 20MPH at the bend seems more appropriate which will account for the safety of the section.

Other sections to note

I would ask you to take a right turn at the B759 a little along East Kilbride Road. This has a visibility splay of about half that proposed by my drive way. This is disputed by the roads department as wrong so I would ask you to look at the picture or sit at the junction and you will see my figure is correct. When you sit at the junction to execute a right turn over the double white line formation I ask you to appreciate that the visibility splay I offer is more than double this but you, I will assume, will execute the right turn with little or no trouble. It is not really a desirable visibility splay and not in keeping with current guidance but it is not strikingly dangerous. Yet the same section of road should have a visibility splay of over 4 times this at 90M to be safe. Somewhat ridiculous to suggest that 90m is required given the shortness of the visibility splay at the B759. Which carries substantially more vehicles than a single family home. If the section was indeed dangerous under public safety the roads department has a duty to close this junction under public safety. Note when you do this maneuver my drive way has more than double the visibility splay of this junction. I am enclosing a picture to show the visibility splay.



Number of movements a day

I also wish to note that the number of movements my drive way would execute in a day. For a single family home it is in the order of **15** movements a day. This mean that my drive way would have the most **miniscule** effect on East Kilbride road. Its a residential house with 2 cars. Its almost comical to suggest that the 2 cars would have any real impact on east kilbride road. Any impact that would occur from a car leaving the house would be fleeting if at all. There has already been 2 approved alterations of a full drive way and enlargement of an openings on East Kilbride road in 2017 and 2016. All with horizontal visibility splays considerably less than my figure of 45M either way. I at least surpass National guidance.

No parking and wheelchair access,


There is limited parking within the area which can be obtained across the road if the area opposite is not full. The scheme beside mine is Printerland states for residents only. Although of course the argument that in theory parking on private land in Scotland cant be restricted especially as there is no bay allocation or permits but it is unfair to have my cars impose themselves on their area especially when parking there is also full. So there is no parking in the area for the house. For wheel chair access there is no provisions and only a narrow pavement of 1.4M which is restricted by the light column at my house which is wheelchair unfriendly given its narrowness when you take into account the light column. I intend to help the situation by giving 60CM of my land to the pavement and pay for the light column to be moved to a more convenient location. As well as other infrastructure required to be moved. Giving wheelchairs more ability to move along the section. I will be improving pavement safety in the location substantially. Currently I am in good health but I wish it noted that this is not even being considered. That an inhabitant of the house may need to use a wheelchair and all the risk factors of getting across the road and along the narrow pavement with a wheelchair have just been ignored. A house with a visibility splay in keeping with current road safety guidance and safer in a residential area, than those provided by the roads department, would be reasonable that this drive be accepted.

Infrastructure currently in my visibility splay

Infrastructure at the house which blocks the visibility splay I have had discussions with Mr Adams of road and lighting and he has advised that he is happy to move what is needed as long as I am willing to pay for such a move. This I am more than happy to do and I would be happy to have that as a condition of approval.

The Road department's visibility splay figures are incompatible with a residential area.

I wish to show with a couple of pictures why this is a residential area and why applying road standards in a residential area is unsafe. Why Designing streets fixes this and why my visibility is safe and fits in with best practice and current safety guidance in the document. During the time the councilors visited my house on the 7th Of November 2018 I recorded their visit as I was advised I could not attend. In this recording a number of people passed but the 2 pictures I am adding are those that children are put in danger from using old figures and wrongly classing the section as a road. It shows how in the 12 minute recording 2 children walked by my house who were under the 1.05M that the road department classes as safe. Even though they would be missed out of the drivers visibility and potentially killed. This is in the space of a 12 minute video during the councilors visit. This issue is resolved by following current guidance and Designing streets. Safety is more important than classification.



This picture and one on the page opposite both children would be safe with Designing streets and not be in danger. Designing streets was created with research. Best practice and current guidance state that to ensure we see these children the vertical visibility splay is set to 60CM not the dangerous 1.05M. Again it also sets a horizontal visibility splay of 43M in a 30MPH zone. To achieve the 60CM vertical visibility I will be bringing my boundary wall to 50CM and removing all permitted development rights so it can't be changed in perpetuity. So given best practice and current guidance shows my visibility is safe. My drive way should be approved.





Lastly so we can see how in a residential area the figures provided by the roads department for a safe visibility is wrong. The vertical is dangerous by virtue that for a residential area 1.05M misses children which is common in residential areas. That alone should be enough to confirm that my visibility is safe or if you wish Designing streets the national guidance is safe but let's now look at the horizontal figure of 90M. Yes this is the size of a football pitch. For a driveway to be safe if we are to believe the road departments figure in their consultation for this planning application a drive way needs a clear section of road of 180M with the drive in the middle. I wonder if there is **any** drive ways on East kilbride road with this figure looking at East Kilbride road it is a winding road so the probability is there are **none, I certainly cant see even one**. I know for sure the two proposals that were approved on East Kilbride road in 2017 and 2016 did not have a visibility splay of horizontal 90M. I provided 65 East Kilbride roads visibility splay. It was in line with the B759 at 20M. Just walk along to 65 East Kilbride road and look for yourself. I would say most visibility splay on East Kilbride road is 45M or less. I have more visibility splay than most drive ways. So the idea that 90M is needed to be safe not only disagrees with the national guidance but also is shown false just by looking at what's already on East Kilbride road.

The Fence which boundaries the pavement and was a concern in the previous local review and had councilor split in the middle as to get clarification on the fence. I would advice the fence has been removed under permitted development. It boundaries the pavement by 60CM and I removed this so the pavement can have a straight run from before where the fence was to 10M in front of my house to give a 2M pavement along my frontage and allow for a set back 2.4M visibility splay.

My Drive way follows the National Road Development guide and more specifically Designing streets. I meet and surpass current guidance and best practice as I hope I have shown and the figures the road department provides are not for a residential area as I also hope I have demonstrated. All aspects of my drive way are confirmed as safe with research given in Designing streets who's visibility splay was created with research showing how speed limiters such as I have give benefit and are a key part to the research in Designing streets. I would ask that my drive be approved with the condition that I understand will be required to ensure the visibility such as a restriction on permitted development height on the wall and the 60CM I give to the pavement to create a 2M pavement in front of my house I fully understand if I need to gift this to the council so it can be joined to the pavement and councils property if this is not possible as I am unsure what can be placed as a condition. The removal of permitted development rights and that I need to level this bit of ground to the pavement level would be allow this to be joined to the pavement and not changed. Either way I will level the 60CM bit of land and prepare it to be part of the pavement. The last condition I accept will be needed is a condition to move items in my visibility splay. Mr Adams of roads and lighting is waiting for my call to start the process. I would ask the councilors approve my drive way with the mentioned conditions.

BLANK PAGE




Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Eastbound	26.2	29.8
Westbound	24.2	28.7
Combined	25.2	29.3




mph mph

On a 7-day average		
13.9%	1.4%	0.0%
7.6%	0.6%	0.0%
10.8%	1.0%	0.0%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (35mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (45mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekday Traffic Total
Eastbound	9674	9053.9	63377
Westbound	9543	8897	62279
Combined	19217	17951	125656




Incidents/Observations
No incidents or observations during the survey period.

BLANK PAGE

Eastbound ▼

Eastbound


Time	Mon 04-Jun	Tue 05-Jun	Wed 06-Jun	Thu 07-Jun	Fri 08-Jun	Sat 09-Jun	Sun 10-Jun	5 Day Avg	7 Day Avg
00:00	17	8	10	19	13	45	51	13	23
00:15	18	9	10	15	23	25	32	15	19
00:30	11	11	12	6	11	30	24	10	15
00:45	6	14	2	5	7	19	38	7	13
01:00	5	5	9	7	8	30	26	7	13
01:15	6	9	1	8	6	25	21	6	11
01:30	8	4	6	1	7	10	21	5	8
01:45	5	2	5	4	9	15	16	5	8
02:00	8	1	4	4	4	11	20	4	7
02:15	5	1	3	1	1	9	12	2	5
02:30	2	3	4	4	3	6	10	3	5
02:45	2	3	2	2	2	13	13	2	5
03:00	3	4	2	1	3	6	10	3	4
03:15	1	1	4	2	3	5	7	2	3
03:30	2	0	2	5	4	3	8	3	3
03:45	7	4	4	4	3	11	11	4	6
04:00	4	4	6	5	4	2	4	5	4
04:15	7	3	4	7	3	9	10	5	6
04:30	8	6	4	11	10	9	12	8	9
04:45	6	8	4	3	7	5	7	6	6
05:00	13	16	7	12	17	7	8	13	11
05:15	19	16	18	20	23	6	4	19	15
05:30	24	28	24	23	28	20	8	25	22
05:45	32	37	38	37	31	11	14	35	29
06:00	35	46	42	36	38	19	6	39	32
06:15	45	40	44	50	39	18	18	44	36
06:30	62	65	73	70	58	25	17	66	53
06:45	92	92	90	90	79	29	14	89	69
07:00	120	112	124	99	99	37	20	111	87
07:15	157	166	157	174	156	31	31	162	125
07:30	223	222	226	217	223	61	26	222	171
07:45	238	242	253	243	224	51	33	240	183
08:00	248	232	236	250	217	67	38	237	184
08:15	275	273	248	275	226	76	40	259	202
08:30	239	261	267	264	250	94	41	256	202
08:45	206	216	254	215	206	100	49	219	178
09:00	219	224	205	219	226	109	61	219	180
09:15	180	130	166	180	152	121	42	162	139
09:30	142	139	139	157	134	108	90	142	130
09:45	117	132	129	126	135	134	106	128	126
10:00	113	129	115	135	132	142	112	125	125
10:15	109	113	145	141	152	164	108	132	133
10:30	111	115	112	131	121	166	120	118	125
10:45	127	94	136	130	127	146	104	123	123
11:00	125	122	122	130	139	144	135	128	131



11:15	116	131	129	135	147	150	126	132	133
11:30	121	146	122	137	153	183	136	136	143
11:45	143	134	151	129	166	161	121	145	144
12:00	114	160	125	147	146	183	133	138	144
12:15	148	136	143	149	179	157	142	151	151
12:30	146	128	126	141	167	185	134	142	147
12:45	153	151	143	144	167	176	177	152	159
13:00	138	129	132	129	168	149	163	139	144
13:15	117	123	150	142	158	167	150	138	144
13:30	133	125	150	122	152	157	150	136	141
13:45	128	134	143	123	159	148	161	137	142
14:00	130	121	136	147	138	151	160	134	140
14:15	133	156	159	148	153	144	166	150	151
14:30	143	163	127	143	152	144	153	146	146
14:45	118	155	146	121	149	146	134	138	138
15:00	159	128	169	167	160	140	142	157	152
15:15	145	146	174	157	209	144	118	166	156
15:30	157	159	161	147	220	142	137	169	160
15:45	157	174	152	179	178	137	167	168	163
16:00	180	184	167	175	195	136	135	180	167
16:15	190	213	189	186	197	148	133	195	179
16:30	167	143	187	172	180	177	140	170	167
16:45	179	189	177	218	182	153	109	189	172
17:00	165	156	184	186	185	173	156	175	172
17:15	169	178	180	210	157	125	116	179	162
17:30	155	168	174	179	177	148	133	171	162
17:45	148	147	171	136	187	145	122	158	151
18:00	171	165	176	161	184	138	105	171	157
18:15	144	157	144	140	171	95	105	151	137
18:30	145	136	147	142	135	109	104	141	131
18:45	127	144	113	129	139	112	102	130	124
19:00	121	129	127	147	118	97	90	128	118
19:15	132	125	122	156	116	99	85	130	119
19:30	102	114	101	154	112	90	89	117	109
19:45	97	119	106	115	100	73	93	107	100
20:00	89	89	95	100	97	75	91	94	91
20:15	91	116	100	101	83	57	76	98	89
20:30	68	74	98	99	75	64	63	83	77
20:45	92	79	87	95	64	62	79	83	80
21:00	86	101	86	113	72	56	68	92	83
21:15	76	82	81	112	93	57	59	89	80
21:30	64	87	72	86	67	56	48	75	69
21:45	61	52	65	58	88	71	37	65	62
22:00	57	72	75	74	66	59	46	69	64
22:15	35	42	47	70	51	42	35	49	46
22:30	38	55	41	44	58	59	31	47	47
22:45	30	30	37	40	41	50	26	36	36
23:00	16	35	26	40	55	56	28	34	37
23:15	13	11	25	26	46	49	22	24	27
23:30	14	27	21	25	35	51	22	24	28
23:45	12	15	18	21	32	58	11	20	24
07-19	7488	7601	7781	7827	8129	6374	5386	7765	7227
06-22	8801	9011	9170	9409	9428	7322	6319	9164	8494
06-00	9016	9298	9460	9749	9812	7746	6540	9467	8803
00-00	9235	9495	9645	9955	10042	8078	6927	9674	9054

Eastbound ▼

Time	Eastbound							5 Day Avg	7 Day Avg
	Mon 04-Jun	Tue 05-Jun	Wed 06-Jun	Thu 07-Jun	Fri 08-Jun	Sat 09-Jun	Sun 10-Jun		
00:00	52	42	34	45	54	119	145	45	70
01:00	24	20	21	20	30	80	84	23	40
02:00	17	8	13	11	10	39	55	12	22
03:00	13	9	12	12	13	25	36	12	17
04:00	25	21	18	26	24	25	33	23	25
05:00	88	97	87	92	99	44	34	93	77
06:00	234	243	249	246	214	91	55	237	190
07:00	738	742	760	733	702	180	110	735	566
08:00	968	982	1005	1004	899	337	168	972	766
09:00	658	625	639	682	647	472	299	650	575
10:00	460	451	508	537	532	618	444	498	507
11:00	505	533	524	531	605	638	518	540	551
12:00	561	575	537	581	659	701	586	583	600
13:00	516	511	575	516	637	621	624	551	571
14:00	524	595	568	559	592	585	613	568	577
15:00	618	607	656	650	767	563	564	660	632
16:00	716	729	720	751	754	614	517	734	686
17:00	637	649	709	711	706	591	527	682	647
18:00	587	602	580	572	629	454	416	594	549
19:00	452	487	456	572	446	359	357	483	447
20:00	340	358	380	395	319	258	309	358	337
21:00	287	322	304	369	320	240	212	320	293
22:00	160	199	200	228	216	210	138	201	193
23:00	55	88	90	112	168	214	83	103	116
07-19	7488	7601	7781	7827	8129	6374	5386	7765	7227
06-22	8801	9011	9170	9409	9428	7322	6319	9164	8494
06-00	9016	9298	9460	9749	9812	7746	6540	9467	8803
00-00	9235	9495	9645	9955	10042	8078	6927	9674	9054



BLANK PAGE

Client: Paolo Di Mambro
 Project: 3606-SCO East Kilbride Road, Busby
 Site: 01-Outside 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby G76 8JY
 Start Date: 04/06/2018

ARX Classification Scheme					
Class No.	No. Axles	Axle Groups	Description	Aggregate	Vehicle Example
1	2	1 or 2	Very Short - Bicycle or Motorcycle	Light	
2	2	1 or 2	Short - Car, 4WD or Light Van		
3	3/4/5	3	Short Towing - Trailer, Caravan etc.		
4	2	2	2-Axle Truck or Bus	Medium	
5	3	2	3-Axle Truck or Bus		
6	>3	2	4-Axle Truck		
7	3	3	3-Axle Articulated Vehicle or Rigid Vehicle & Trailer	Heavy	
8	4	>2	4-Axle Articulated Vehicle or Rigid Vehicle & Trailer		
9	5	>2	5-Axle Articulated Vehicle or Rigid Vehicle & Trailer		
10	>=6	>2	6 (or more) Axle Articulated Vehicle or Rigid Vehicle & Trailer		
11	>6	4	B-Double or Heavy Truck & Trailer		
12	>6	>=5	Double or Triple Heavy Truck & 2 (or more) Trailers		

Monday ▼ Eastbound ▼

	Eastbound												
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
04-Jun													
00:00	17	0	14	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
00:15	18	0	15	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
00:30	11	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
00:45	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
01:00	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
01:15	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
01:30	8	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
01:45	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
02:00	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
02:15	5	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
02:30	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
02:45	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
03:00	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
03:15	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
03:30	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
03:45	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:00	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:15	7	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:30	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
04:45	6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
05:00	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
05:15	19	1	14	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
05:30	24	0	20	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
05:45	32	0	28	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
06:00	35	0	31	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
06:15	45	1	42	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
06:30	62	0	55	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
06:45	92	0	86	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
07:00	120	2	111	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07:15	157	0	150	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
07:30	223	0	213	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
07:45	238	1	220	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
08:00	248	0	233	1	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
08:15	275	2	254	3	13	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
08:30	239	1	223	1	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
08:45	206	1	197	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

21:45	61	1	59	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22:00	57	0	54	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22:15	35	0	33	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22:30	38	1	35	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22:45	30	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23:00	16	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23:15	13	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23:30	14	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23:45	12	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	7488	28	6963	29	432	8	14	1	8	2	3	0
06-22	8801	39	8216	31	475	9	14	1	11	2	3	0
06-00	9016	42	8421	31	482	9	14	1	11	2	3	0
00-00	9235	44	8615	31	502	11	15	1	11	2	3	0


BLANK PAGE

Eastbound						
Day	PC/MC	CAR	LGV & PSV 2Axle	OGV1 & PSV 3 Axle	OGV2	Total
Monday	44	8646	502	11	32	9235
Tuesday	74	8888	498	12	23	9495
Wednesday	62	9057	487	15	23	9644
Thursday	63	9336	513	25	17	9954
Friday	62	9405	525	20	26	10038
Saturday	39	7758	254	7	19	8077
Sunday	45	6706	167	0	9	6927
5day	61	9066	505	17	24	9673
7day	60	8889	455	16	22	9053

Westbound						
Day	PC/MC	CAR	LGV & PSV 2Axle	OGV1 & PSV 3 Axle	OGV2	Total
Monday	68	8611	442	29	53	9203
Tuesday	84	8851	464	39	69	9507
Wednesday	73	8882	475	29	68	9527
Thursday	72	9005	473	34	72	9656
Friday	70	9167	490	26	66	9819
Saturday	58	7547	223	6	20	7854
Sunday	48	6506	145	2	10	6711
5day	73	8903	469	31	66	9542
7day	68	8367	387	24	51	8897

Combined						
Day	PC/MC	CAR	LGV & PSV 2Axle	OGV1 & PSV 3 Axle	OGV2	Total
Monday	112	17257	944	40	85	18438
Tuesday	158	17739	962	51	92	19002
Wednesday	135	17939	962	44	91	19171
Thursday	135	18341	986	59	89	19610
Friday	132	18572	1015	46	92	19857
Saturday	97	15305	477	13	39	15931
Sunday	93	13212	312	2	19	13638
5day	134	17970	974	48	90	19216
7day	123	16909	808	36	72	17950

Monday ▼



BLANK PAGE

Monday

Eastbound

04-Jun Time	Total	0-10	10-15	15-20	20-25	25-30	30-35	35-40	40-45	45-50	50-55	55-60	60-65	65-70	70-75	75-80	80-85	85-90	90-95	95-100	100+	30		35		45		Avg	85th	95th
																						>PSL	%	ACPO	%	DFT	%			
00:00	52	0	1	0	6	27	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	35%	4	8%	0	0%	28.9	33.9	36.3
01:00	24	0	1	0	4	7	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	50%	1	4%	0	0%	29.0	33.9	35.2
02:00	17	1	0	0	2	7	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	41%	3	18%	0	0%	29.0	35.4	-
03:00	13	0	1	0	1	6	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	38%	3	23%	0	0%	29.2	36.3	-
04:00	25	0	0	0	1	5	13	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	76%	6	24%	0	0%	32.0	36.1	39.1
05:00	88	0	1	3	10	27	38	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	53%	9	10%	0	0%	29.5	34.0	36.6
06:00	234	0	3	6	16	116	80	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	40%	13	6%	0	0%	29.2	33.2	35.1
07:00	738	6	25	73	208	348	77	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	11%	1	0%	0	0%	25.0	29.4	31.3
08:00	968	4	31	120	388	395	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	3%	0	0%	0	0%	23.8	27.5	29.4
09:00	658	1	7	30	199	378	40	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	7%	3	0%	0	0%	25.7	28.8	30.4
10:00	460	0	5	30	116	246	61	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	14%	2	0%	0	0%	26.2	29.9	31.8
11:00	505	0	3	20	108	311	57	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	12%	6	1%	1	0%	26.7	29.8	31.9
12:00	561	0	8	15	148	338	49	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	9%	3	1%	0	0%	26.2	29.3	31.2
13:00	516	1	2	18	163	295	35	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	7%	2	0%	0	0%	25.8	28.8	30.9
14:00	524	0	3	8	150	304	58	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	11%	1	0%	0	0%	26.4	29.4	31.1
15:00	618	0	1	17	233	322	43	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	7%	2	0%	0	0%	25.6	28.6	30.5
16:00	716	2	8	60	244	327	65	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	10%	10	1%	0	0%	25.3	28.9	31.5
17:00	637	5	27	59	212	290	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	7%	0	0%	0	0%	24.4	28.4	30.5
18:00	587	1	5	32	147	319	78	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	14%	5	1%	0	0%	26.2	29.9	31.6
19:00	452	0	5	4	69	279	89	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	21%	6	1%	0	0%	27.7	30.4	32.3
20:00	340	0	1	15	56	189	71	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	23%	8	2%	1	0%	27.6	31.2	34.2
21:00	287	0	2	7	30	196	49	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	18%	3	1%	0	0%	27.5	30.3	31.8
22:00	160	1	1	6	28	78	36	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	29%	10	6%	0	0%	27.8	32.8	35.4
23:00	55	0	1	0	3	22	23	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	53%	6	11%	0	0%	30.2	34.0	38.3
07-19	7488	20	125	482	2316	3873	637	29	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	672	9%	35	0%	1	0%	25.5	29.0	31.0
06-22	8801	20	136	514	2487	4653	926	55	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	991	11%	65	1%	2	0%	25.8	29.5	31.5
06-00	9016	21	138	520	2518	4753	985	68	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1066	12%	81	1%	2	0%	25.9	29.5	31.7
00-00	9235	22	142	523	2542	4832	1067	91	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1174	13%	107	1%	2	0%	26.0	29.7	31.9

Abbreviations	
PSL	Posted Speed Limit
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers (Used to display the speed limit the police will generally enforce, 110% of PSL +2mph)
DFT	Department for Transport (Used to display a speed statistic used by the government looking at vehicles travelling over 15mph above the PSL)



BLANK PAGE

Eastbound							
Day	Avg	85th	95th	% >PSL	% >ACPO	% >DFT	
Monday	26	29.7	31.9	13%	1%	0.0%	
Tuesday	25.8	29.6	31.9	13%	1%	0.0%	
Wednesday	25.8	29.6	32	13%	1%	0.0%	
Thursday	25.6	29.5	31.8	12%	1%	0.0%	
Friday	26.1	29.5	32.1	12%	1%	0.0%	
Saturday	26.9	30.3	32.7	18%	2%	0.0%	
Sunday	27.3	30.6	32.9	19%	2%	0.0%	
5day	25.9	29.6	32	12%	1%	0.0%	
7day	26.2	29.8	32.2	14%	1%	0.0%	

Westbound							
Day	Avg	85th	95th	% >PSL	% >ACPO	% >DFT	
Monday	23.8	28.3	30.6	7%	1%	0.1%	
Tuesday	23.2	28.4	30.6	7%	1%	0.0%	
Wednesday	23.5	28.4	30.5	7%	0%	0.0%	
Thursday	23.3	28.3	30.4	6%	0%	0.0%	
Friday	24.2	28.5	30.5	7%	0%	0.0%	
Saturday	26	29.3	31.3	10%	1%	0.0%	
Sunday	26.4	29.5	31.7	11%	1%	0.0%	
5day	23.6	28.4	30.5	7%	1%	0.0%	
7day	24.2	28.7	30.8	8%	1%	0.0%	

Combined							
Day	Avg	85th	95th	% >PSL	% >ACPO	% >DFT	
Monday	24.9	29.1	31.3	10%	1%	0.0%	
Tuesday	24.5	29.1	31.4	10%	1%	0.0%	
Wednesday	24.6	29	31.4	10%	1%	0.0%	
Thursday	24.5	28.9	31.2	9%	1%	0.0%	
Friday	25.2	29.1	31.4	10%	1%	0.0%	
Saturday	26.5	29.8	32.1	14%	1%	0.0%	
Sunday	26.9	30.1	32.4	16%	1%	0.0%	
5day	24.7	29	31.3	10%	1%	0.0%	
7day	25.2	29	31.3	11%	1%	0.0%	

Eastbound ▼
Monday ▼




Abbreviations	
PSL	Posted Speed Limit
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers (Used to display the speed limit the police will generally enforce, 110% of PSL +2mph)
DFT	Department for Transport (Used to display a speed statistic used by the government looking at vehicles travelling over 15mph above the PSL)

BLANK PAGE

We should not make the mistake of calling the section a road.

The section outside my house is a residential area. It has substantial foot traffic. Which means it should have a visibility splay to accommodate this. While the councilors in a 12 minute recording of their visit to my house. A number of pedestrians passed but the three pictures are of those that had children or animals which were put in danger by a policy of not using the best advice for visibility splay using the most up to date research and best practice we have. 1.05M is just dangerous and 90M is just not required. Designing streets was created for a reason.







Firstly its obvious that the section has a number of pedestrians. Designing streets would ensure the safety of every one. Roads wrongly allocating this as a road despite evidence that it should be classed as a street is ignoring best practices and current guidance. Assuming I did have 90M either side. I would be classed as safe in their eyes but yet in the space of slightly over 12 minutes I could of killed 2 children and a dog. **Not very safe.** Designing streets stops this danger and accordingly defines my visibility as safe.

PLANS/PHOTOGRAPHS/DRAWINGS


BLANK PAGE




Elevation of existing wall 1:100



Elevation of proposed wall and driveway 1:100



Section through proposed driveway 1:50



This drawing is the property of Arc Architectural Services. Copyright is reserved by them and the drawing is issued on the condition that it is not copied, reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the consent in writing of Arc Architectural Services. N.B. any variations between stated dimensions and site dimensions should be reported to the surveyor prior to work being executed.
Notes:

Do not scale from drawing
All dimensions to be confirmed on site and any discrepancies notified to Arc Architectural Services
This drawing is solely for the purposes of obtaining Local Authority Approval. Additional information may be required for construction purposes. No liability will be accepted for any omission from this drawing should the drawing be used for construction purposes


arc architectural services ltd

0141 844 0039 : 07799 401 577
mail@arcarchitecture.com
25 cortmallow avenue, glasgow g33 1te



Mr. Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G52 2SE

Formation of driveway
Proposed elevations and section

SCALE 1:50	DATE July '18	BY
DWG NO DP-441-002		REV B



DB32 Private Car
 Overall Length 13.855ft
 Overall Width 5.627ft
 Overall Body Height 4.567ft
 Min Body Ground Clearance 0.766ft
 Max Track Width 5.344ft
 Lock to lock time 4.00s
 Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius 18.963ft



Rev	DESCRIPTION	Date	By	Eng
	INITIAL ISSUE	29/05/18	OHA/KDF	
	AMENDMENTS			

This drawing to be read in conjunction with:
 Drawing Nos. _____
 Bar Schedule Nos. _____

Proposed Development,
 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby,
 East Renfrewshire

Paolo Di Mambro

General Arrangements
 Scale: 1:100 @ A1



Drawn by: OHA	Contract No.:	Drawing No.:	Rev.:
Checked by: KDF	A/180453	900	-
Engineer: KDF			



Rev	INITIAL ISSUE	22/06/18	OHA/KDF
	AMENDMENTS	Date	By Eng

This drawing to be read in conjunction with:
 Drawing Nos. _____
 Bar Schedule Nos. _____


Proposed Development,
 29 East Kilbride, Busby,
 East Renfrewshire

Paolo Di Mambro

Visibility Splays for Easter Road,
 B759 and 65 East Kilbride Road
 Scale _____



Drawn by	OHA	Contract No.	A/180453	Drawing No.	904	Rev.	-
Checked by	KDF	Engineer	KDF				



Proposed plan 1:100

arc architectural services ltd


0141 844 0039 : 07799 401 577
mail@arcarchitecture.com
25 cortmalaw avenue, glasgow g33 1te


Mr. Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G52 2SE

Formation of driveway
Proposed plans



SCALE As shown DATE Dec '18 BY

DWG NO DP-441-001 REV





DB32 Private Car
 Overall Length 13.855ft
 Overall Width 5.627ft
 Overall Body Height 4.567ft
 Min Body Ground Clearance 0.766ft
 Max Track Width 5.344ft
 Lock to lock time 4.00s
 Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius 18.963ft



Rev	DESCRIPTION	Date	By	Eng
	INITIAL ISSUE	29/05/18	OHA/KDF	
	AMENDMENTS			

This drawing to be read in conjunction with:
 Drawing Nos. _____
 Bar Schedule Nos. _____


Proposed Development,
 29 East Kilbride Road, Busby,
 East Renfrewshire

Paolo Di Mambro


General Arrangements
 Scale: 1:100 @ A1




Drawn by: OHA	Contract No.:	Drawing No.:	Rev.:
Checked by: KDF	A/180453	900	-
Engineer: KDF			



Site plan 1:500



Location plan 1:1250



This drawing is the property of Arc Architectural Services. Copyright is reserved by them and the drawing is issued on the condition that it is not copied, reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the consent in writing of Arc Architectural Services. N.B. any variations between stated dimensions and site dimensions should be reported to the surveyor prior to work being executed.

Notes:
Do not scale from drawing
All dimensions to be confirmed on site and any discrepancies notified to Arc Architectural Services
This drawing is solely for the purposes of obtaining Local Authority Approval. Additional information may be required for construction purposes. No liability will be accepted for any omission from this drawing should the drawing be used for construction purposes

arc architectural services ltd


0141 844 0039 : 07799 401 577
mail@arcarchitecture.com
25 cortmallow avenue, glasgow g33 1te

Mr. Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G52 2SE

**Formation of driveway
Existing location plan & site plan**

SCALE 1:1250 / 1:500 DATE Mar '18 BY

DWG NO P-441-001 REV



Proposed plan 1:100

arc architectural services ltd


0141 844 0039 : 07799 401 577
mail@arcarchitecture.com
25 cortmalaw avenue, glasgow g33 1te


Mr. Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G52 2SE

Formation of driveway
Proposed plans


SCALE As shown DATE Dec '18 BY

DWG NO DP-441-001 REV







Elevation of existing wall 1:100



Elevation of proposed wall and driveway 1:100



Section through proposed driveway 1:50



This drawing is the property of Arc Architectural Services. Copyright is reserved by them and the drawing is issued on the condition that it is not copied, reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the consent in writing of Arc Architectural Services. N.B. any variations between stated dimensions and site dimensions should be reported to the surveyor prior to work being executed.
Notes:

Do not scale from drawing
All dimensions to be confirmed on site and any discrepancies notified to Arc Architectural Services
This drawing is solely for the purposes of obtaining Local Authority Approval. Additional information may be required for construction purposes. No liability will be accepted for any omission from this drawing should the drawing be used for construction purposes

arc architectural services ltd

0141 844 0039 : 07799 401 577
mail@arcarchitecture.com
25 cortmallow avenue, glasgow g33 1te

Mr. Paolo Di Mambro
29 East Kilbride Road
Busby
East Renfrewshire
G52 2SE

Formation of driveway
Proposed elevations and section

SCALE 1:50	DATE July '18	BY
DWG NO DP-441-002		REV B