

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Anne Stather

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

1) Angus Council have failed in their obligation to notify me as property owner and occupier of Abbeybank House as per their own policy and norms. While the proposed development has a significant impact on all neighbours and pedestrians in the area, one of the largest impacts is around Abbeybank House but yet we were not notified as confirmed in the Neighbour notification - LIST OF NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED document dated 18th June. This lack of notification plus our inability to engage through meetings as a result of on-going pandemic are a cause for concern about the developers intentions and actions.

2) The main living area of Abbeybank House including living room, bedrooms and bathroom all look directly towards and downward onto a proposed refuse site, with a proposed high volume of residences and therefore waste against what is a relatively a small area. I have obvious concerns around smell, visual impact and general annoyance. Abbeybank House is a longstanding and well known property in the local area, and the prospect of it now facing onto a refuse site does not take this into consideration.

3) Currently the Springfield Terrace access/exit poses a significant risk to pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. It is effectively a 4 way junction cutting across a pavement for the current exit/entry to Abbeybank House. With this already a hazard, coupled with a recent increase in walking and cycling, any proposed new development needs careful management and engagement with existing stakeholders such as myself and other neighbours to detail our experience and concerns.

4) Given the proposed new development is not in line with its surrounding architecture and properties, there is an obvious concern around a negative impact on existing properties rental and capital values.

As mentioned, with no formal notification and no public engagement possibility, I object to the proposed development application and believe there needs to be much wider dialogue before any movement

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Darren Burnett

Address: 6 Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Noise/Nuisance and smell

It is unclear what green outdoor space has been allocated to the flats on this site. It seems a large amount of properties for such a small site. I am concerned about the large number of occupants and the associated noise they would cause to a quiet neighbourhood. Block 5 is situated directly in front of our property and the plans show it sits closer than any of the other blocks. I am concerned about noise nuisance and impact on the privacy of our property.

Environmental Impact

The site area is an urban area of mature trees and local wildlife. In the original planning application they have confirmed the site has no trees. This is incorrect, it has many trees and several mature ones. The site houses a family of foxes, and local deer are often seen. Some of the trees onsite are seen to be homes to bees and birds, as well as other wildlife. I fail to see how this development can go ahead without having a huge impact on the local environment.

Wall

Boundary wall at our property extends up to site, plans show work to be done on this wall.

Concerned about impact this will have on very old wall, any work will surely destabilise it and have a negative impact on the part which we own. Require more information about this and an assurance the wall will not be damaged. Consideration should be given on work to strengthen and repoint it prior to any adjustments being made to it.

From: Darren Burnett
Sent: 06 July 2020 13:31
To: PLNProcessing <PLNProcessing@angus.gov.uk>
Subject: Abbeybank Development

Hello,

I would like clarity as to why such a complex development process has been undertaken when face to face meetings, public meetings and suitable site visits are not possible due to Covid-19.

This land has been vacant since I bought my house back in 2010 so I fail to see any reason why this needs to be rushed through at this difficult time which clearly undermines the transparency of the process adopted by Angus Council.

The 2000 character limit for adding any comments to those affected by this potential development are frankly pretty insulting. I would like clarity as to how I lodge a more detailed concern report.

While not against any development on the site I have a number of concerns I would like looked into from the following.

1. Infrastructure and traffic volume
2. Parking around a new school development that is already problematic and increases risk to pupil safety.
3. Wildlife impact on the proposed land which has a number of foxes, deer, bees and large variety of birds.
4. Structural changes / demolition to existing lodge houses and walls that date back over 200 years in history.
5. Drainage into the area of my property given the nature and difficulty of the site.
6. Noise pollution, potential antisocial behaviour given the size of the proposed development (in keeping with several others built recently by this home provider)
7. Privacy given that the new development will sit on higher land close to my property.
8. Proposed landscaping between my property boundary and the new proposed development.
9. The large volume of traffic the road already takes causes vibration to my house and clear damage to the old boundary wall on Springfield Terrace. Large construction vehicles will only increase this. What will be done to prevent this.
10. Impact on valuation of existing properties from the proposed development.
11. The original application has ticked No Trees however the site has lots of trees.

Historically only approval given for 9 houses on this fairly small site. This also was for 5 detached houses nearest to our home and 4 semi detached up on Hayshead Road.

This proposed 20 unit development is significantly different and not in keeping with any properties in the surrounding area.

I feel a lot more community consultation is required to look at above points and many others may have before the green light should be given to any development on this site.

At best during the current pandemic this should be placed on hold until better communication methods are back in play.

Please reply to acknowledge receipt of this e mail within the 21 day period and inform me how to document a bigger concern report.

Thanks Darren.

Darren Burnett
6 Springfield Terrace,
Arbroath.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mr Darren Burnett

Address: 6 Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD111EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: My stance remains consistent with previous concerns I have raised regarding this development.

Privacy issues to my and other properties in Springfield Terrace given the scale and style of housing chosen for this site.

The lowering of the development height and changes to layout including road do not do enough to mitigate my previous reasons for objecting.

The new road junction onto Springfield Terrace will create a further problem on an already busy road with numerous junctions so close together. This stretch of road has had a fatal and number of serious accidents in the last 3 or 4 years and this latest application will only increase the safety risks on this road.

I have seen no update in relation to wildlife which many people have commented on throughout this process.

The current boundary fence at the Springfield Terrace boundary is a number of years old and any construction would require a further boundary fence erected at the the new development side given that there is a retainer brick wall situated at that side of the development which would undoubtedly be climbed by any youths creating more privacy issues. How this area around the boundary fences is landscaped is not clear on either application and this also impacts on our privacy.

The scale and type of development is in my opinion too large for the site given the road layout and surrounding risk factors (road lay outs and large community school hub nearby).

I have no doubt that the proposed development will have a negative impact on the value of my property and still see no documentation as to what the developer proposed to do with the historical old brick wall in Springfield Terrace which already suffers from damage without large scale building work and sections being knocked down.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mr Edward Duff

Address: 8 Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The population density of the proposed development could be described as "sardine-like".

1). The additional proposed entrance road to the development on Springfield Terrace seems inadvisable due to the fact that the following entrances and roads already cause a significant danger to pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and the disabled. This is a busy pavement. The following entrances exist within a distance of only 70 metres on the west side of Springfield Terrace.

As following: (A) Wesley Gardens, (B) Entrance to properties 6,7 and 8 Springfield Terrace, (C) THE PROPOSED ADDITIONAL ENTRANCE from Springfield Terrace, (D) Entrance to Abbeybank House, (E) Clifftown Road access on the opposite side of Springfield Terrace - this is a major junction.

The fire station should have easy and immediate access to Springfield Terrace. By allowing this development, extra cars coming onto Springfield Terrace, could cause a dangerous delay.

2). Communal Bins - Communal bins which will be close to our property can become untidy, this will without doubt attract seagulls which can be aggressive, cause pollution and noise disturbance.

3). The boundary between the properties - The distance between my property and the boundary fence is for most of the length my house only 2.5m

4). As a result of the severe slope, we will have two bedrooms, our one kitchen window, a window at the rear of our garden, and the ground floor level windowed toilet being overlooked. Also, due to

the slope there will be no privacy whatsoever in the garden.

5). It is regrettable that no public meeting can be organised at the moment for obvious valid reasons. It would be desirable if this could be arranged once the problem with Covid-19 has been resolved. Finally, the proposed development looks out of place, i.e. does not enhance the appearance of this part of Arbroath. We note that the Scottish Episcopal church of St. Mary's is listed and comes within this desirable, historical area of Arbroath.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mr Findlay Stephen

Address: 3 Hayshead Road Arbroath DD115AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Proposed development of Erection of 20 Affordable Homes within the Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath.

My objections / questions are as below,

1. Currently my property has 95% privacy at the back garden, this will be reduced significantly with the proposed development.
2. Noise pollution on my property from the proposed development will increase dramatically.
3. Light pollution on my property from the proposed development will increase dramatically.
4. Excessive traffic within an already congested street will increase dramatically.
5. I feel my property value will reduce significantly due to having a development of such going ahead.
6. Site area / size, it would be far more in keeping with the existing properties to have a lesser amount of properties built, rather than ramming in as many properties as possible to ensure the maximum revenue is generated.
7. The proposed development has in no way been designed to fit in with the existing properties.
8. Refuse area appears to be in close proximity to Hayshead road which will generate unwanted smells which will have an effect on my standard of living.
9. Previous planning applications were stopped / changed due to my property losing its privacy within my back garden. Has this been taken into account?
10. Access to Hayshead road! This has never been an access point, how safe will this be due to close proximity to the junction at Hayshead road / Seaton Road.
11. Abbyview Campus has already created a massive increase in the volume of traffic on Hayshead road. This proposed new development will only add to the already extremely busy / unsafe conditions.
12. Over the last 10+ years the site has become home to an assortment of wildlife, Deer, Foxes,

Squirrels, Hedgehogs, Bats. Has this been considered by the developer?

I feel my family's quality of life / mental state will be reduced and for these reasons I strongly object to have a development of this size going ahead in this area.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mr George Skinner

Address: 5 Hayshead Road Arbroath DD115AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Although I am not invited to comment, I nonetheless agree with comments already made and would like to add my opinion

Hayshead Rd is already filled beyond capacity at start and finish times for Abbey Campus school. A recent ban on large trucks has been implemented to alleviate these issues. The proposal for 8 flats will remove parking facilities for parents dropping kids off and will cause even more pressure in the immediate vicinity of the school gates. What measures will be implemented to ensure the safety of all during peak times?

On a similar theme, does the planning process consider that it might be a good idea to build family homes near to schools rather than single person homes? If 4 families were to be housed here instead of 8 singles, then it would in a small way help alleviate the congestion problem as it would mean 4 fewer families needing to drive to school

The plans illustrate capacity for 16 bins for the 8 flats on Hayshead Rd. That does not provide for garden or food caddy's and I think the area has the potential to become overcrowded, messy and spill out of the area provided and become a public health issue

My concern re the Springfield Road part of the proposal is that as a pedestrian who regularly uses this road to access the town centre, I fear for the safety of pedestrians and road users on an already busy and fast section of road. The new access road will mean there are four entrances to properties in a very short section of the road excluding the Clifftown road junction. I think these property accesses will be too close and will become a significant safety issue if approved

Generally I welcome the development but I would prefer to see family homes given the proximity to the school rather than single person flats which would help encourage families to walk to school & other parts of town in line with general guidance for good health and wellbeing and I sincerely

hope these points are given serious consideration.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mr Leonard Cross

Address: 7 Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I've emailed my full comments, requesting these & full responses be publicly available on the Council's website.

I wish to promote more open & transparent community engagement, helping to ensure a better outcome for this proposed development.

1. A DIMINISHED PROCESS: The planning process as relating to the application is non transparent, discriminatory & unreasonable, prohibiting or diminishing public engagement. It should be put on hold pending lifting of Covid 19 prohibitions, enabling in person public consultation between stakeholders & with Council officers & members. Open, transparent community engagement that is not rushed, but is deliberative will facilitate joined up thinking, mitigating against deleterious outcomes.

2. SPECIFIC CONCERNS: The planning application for this high density housing development:

- is out for final consultation on the basis of a "preliminary" drainage plan. Restrictions on communication compromise stakeholders' ability to view, evaluate & if desired oppose the final drainage plan
- provides no assurances regarding measures for providing adequate personal, social & recreational space for the proposed developments' residents, or to mitigate the negative impact of an almost certain step increase in local vehicle congestion
- is very likely to result in much increased noise, nuisance & smell which is not mitigated by the planning application,
- is not in keeping with the area's character
- is silent on intentions for the mature woodland, established in the years that the site has been

vacant. It supports the local eco system including wildlife & provides a natural barrier between the site & adjacent residences. It should be preserved & maintained

3. ISSUES FOR CLARIFICATION: Of 15 discrete issues requiring Council responses I ask if the underpinning process has been independently audited and assessed for compliance with

a the National Planning Framework

b the Local Development Plan

c PANs including PAN 81 on community engagement

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 July 2020 15:06
To: PLANNING <PLANNING@angus.gov.uk>
Subject: Abbey Bank House planning proposal - reference 30/00395

Dear sir/madam,

see attached word and pdf documents copies of my document which sets out my:

- complaint regarding the Council's process regarding this proposed development [**reference 30/00395**], citing it as non transparent, discriminatory and unreasonable,
- specific objections to aspects of the planning application **reference 30/00395**,
- sundry issues on which I require clarification regarding planning application, **reference 30/00395**

For your information I accessed the Council's Public access system at <https://planning.angus.gov.uk/online-applications/>, as referenced on the "**Notice for Serving on Neighbours**" letter dated 18 June 2020. Having done so it was not self-evident how I can either upload my document to the Council's publically available website or copy and paste its contents to the website.

That being said, I trust that the Council will

- ensure that my comments are uploaded in full to the publicly available website,
- ensure that all of my points are taken into consideration, and
- respond in full to all of of the concerns and issues that I have raised with regards this planning application, **reference 30/00395**

Can you please confirm:

- acknowledgement of this email,
- that the content of my document will be publically available in its entirety via the Council's website, that the Council will in due course publish its responses to all points that I have raised and ensure that these are all made publically available.

Please note that I called the number provided [**03452 777 778**] as referenced on "**Notice for Serving on Neighbours**" letter dated 18 June 2020 to seek clarification and advice on the protocol for formally

providing my representation, only to be directed back to the Council's website. This absence of in person support is itself unsatisfactory and is absolutely a denial of process to any stakeholder who does not possess a computer or otherwise does not have access to the internet.

Thursday 9 July is the deadline for the end of the public consultation process. Accordingly, if protocol demands that I personally submit my comments via the website, please ensure that someone calls me to clarify the process for doing so as a matter of urgency.

My contact number is [REDACTED]

Otherwise email me on [REDACTED] providing me with a personal Council contact number of an appropriate Council Officer who I can call to talk me through the protocol and process for ensuring that my objection is heard and formally registered.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter

Leonard E Cross

I am registering my objections to the Abbey Bank House application reference 30/00395 on the following basis

A DIMNISHED PROCESS

The Council's planning process is non transparent, discriminatory and unreasonable, prohibiting or diminishing public engagement and therefore is flawed and should not stand.

The Councils Residents Notification Letter itself acknowledges a diminished process. Specifically:

- "do not write to us by mail"
- "in the current circumstances officers will not engage with members of the public..."

Due to the high density of the proposed development, the wider community should be consulted, their concerns recorded and made public. People who don't have access to a computer, email or internet are unfairly excluded from the process as currently constituted.

Personally I cannot properly envisage the development or its impact on my property (7 Springfield Terrace) without an in person site visit and consultation with a planning department officer,

Absence of in person engagement diminishes the process, attracting inherent risk of deleterious outcomes.

The impact of this high density development, should it proceed, will be consequential. It's in everyone's interests that it is thorough, deliberative and not rushed.

The process should be put on hold until we return to normality.

SPECIFIC CONCERNS

I object to planning application reference **30/00395 – Abbey Bank House**, setting out my current reasons below

water drainage infrastructure

I believe the proposal is for 28 parking spaces, to be located in the middle and north side of the proposed development. My overarching concerns are:

- the totality of hard areas, indicative of an overcrowded development,
- water run off down the steep slope from car parking and other hard areas that rise from private residences to the southern boundary of the proposed development site.

The preliminary design provides no assurances that storm drainage or other protective measures will be sufficiently robust to prevent water run-off and localised flooding.

I acknowledge that Angus Council has a policy on drainage, Policy PV15, set out at page 63 of the Local Plan. It says the following which is relevant:

“All new development (except single dwelling and developments that discharge directly to coastal waters will be required to provide Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) to accommodate surface water drainage and long term maintenance must be agreed with the local authority. SUDs schemes can contribute to local green networks, biodiversity and provision of amenity open space and should form an integral part of the design process. Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) will be required for new development where appropriate to identify potential network issues and minimise any reduction in existing levels of service”.

This is a significant issue because the slope down to the houses in Springfield Terrace varies between 1 in 2 and 1 in 4. That has the potential to cause a serious run off problem on the slope if drainage measures are inadequate. I would expect it to be specifically addressed in the planning application and I cannot see that it has been so far.

Specifically, within the drainage plan it states:

"preliminary design based on assessment from preliminary trial pit information with final design to follow further investigation and testing after corona virus restrictions”.

The very fact that the planning application is out to final residents' consultation on the basis of a "**preliminary**" design is in and of itself inadequate.

Bringing along a further design, most likely after the expiry of neighbour consultation, is unsatisfactory.

This planning application should not advance in the timescales proposed because with lockdown impacts and uncertainty about the final plan, stakeholders are being treated unfairly in administrative law.

Restrictions on communication, as set out in the Council's Residents Notification Letter, compromises stakeholders' ability to view, evaluate and if desired oppose the final drainage plan.

Hayshead Primary

The recently rebuilt Hayshead Primary [February 2020] and merger with St Thomas's Primary has from simple observation negatively impacted traffic flow and congestion. Adding a high density housing development within the immediate locality can only have further negative impact.

Further, I am concerned that adequacy of personal outdoor recreational space for residents within such a high density development has not been addressed.

The proposed plan provides no assurances regarding measures for providing personal recreational space, or to mitigate the almost certain step increase in local vehicle congestion.

Noise, nuisance and smell

The proposed high density development is very likely to result in much increased noise, nuisance and smell which is not mitigated by the development application.

impact on adjacent property and the local area

The area adjacent to the proposed high density development is a mixture of semi-detached, detached housing and garden allotments. A high density multi-unit housing development is not in keeping with the character of the area. It will inevitably negatively impact on the character of the area.

privacy and amenity

Without an on-site visit and in person consultation I cannot obtain assurances that the development will not overlook and encroach on my property and its privacy.

Whilst trees have grown unchecked on the site over the years, encroaching upon and deteriorating boundary fencing, it has nevertheless grown into an area of mature untended woodland that:

- supports the local eco system - specifically deer, fox, bird and bee population,
- provides a natural barrier that enhances privacy to 6, 7 and 8 Springfield Terrace.

Preserving, appropriate pruning and maintaining these trees mitigates the negative impact of the high density development on private housing bordering the southern boundary of the site, providing separation and privacy for all residents,

Further, I consider destruction of mature woodland would be an act of environmental vandalism.

It is reasonable that the developer:

- considers ceding title to an appropriate amount of footage back from the sites current southern boundary.
- constructs replacement boundary fencing of significant height, structure and durability

given the steep down slope of the development site's southern boundary has no value or utility to the development.

I trust that the Council can bring its influence to bear on this matter to help address oversight and even reduce noise pollution.

BOUNDARY TREATMENT PLAN

The Boundary Treatment planning documents are difficult to read, and without consultation I note the following:

“There is an existing masonry retaining wall and wooden fence to this boundary. The intension would be not to change this boundary as exists unless the condition (or other contributing factors) means an alternative must be discussed with the local authority”.

Vegetation and trees have not been attended to by the site owner. This absence of care has negatively impacted on the state of boundary fence between the proposed development site and 6, 7 and 8 Springfield Terrace.

It is reasonable to expect that the developer should replace this fencing to an appropriate standard and height to ensure that these properties are not overlooked or otherwise negatively impacted by the proposed development.

In summary, the developer replacing the existing boundary fence with a better, taller, more durable boundary fence on the southern boundary of the proposed development site, augmented by retention of woodland, will help address resident concerns regarding retaining their amenity, privacy, reduction of noise and enjoyment of personal space.

In conclusion, any final development plans that may address my current concerns and those of the wider community will be materially different from those that I and other residents are being currently asked to comment on.

ISSUES FOR CLARIFICATION

From personal perusal of documents available on-line, and without the ability to consult the Council, the following sundry issues require clarification.

Responses may flag other issues which merit objection.

1. Identified as a “**difficult site**” This is highly subjective. The site is not “difficult” if set aside as public recreational space or limited say to construction of a small scale development, keeping in character of the area. I surmise that the site has only become “difficult” given an ambitious proposal for a high density development designed to maximise:
 - site value to its seller,
 - financial return for the developer and in turn the Housing Association as landlord of the proposed housing units

There is a requirement that any ‘difficulties’ are made publically transparent and not a statement based on rhetoric. The following issues require full public explanation by the Council and the developer, whilst also facilitating the due process of public comment and consultation.

a. What are the 'difficulties' with the site & the proposed development?

The difficulties disclosed by the developer in the media require explanation.

Being overgrown is not an issue for a bulldozer!

b. How will the 'difficulties' be addressed?

The most likely issues are slope, drainage, meeting onsite requirements as per the local plan, access and impact on the local neighbourhood / environment.

c. What impacts on neighbouring properties will the 'difficulties' & addressing the 'difficulties' have?

d. Any costs of addressing the 'difficulties' to be shared and/or passed onto the neighbouring properties?

Unambiguous clarification on this matter is essential. My concern is personal financial loss should I need to spend money to correct the impact of defective drainage on my property. The Council needs to take action to terminate this risk.

2. Is the proposed development suitable for the existing neighbourhood character, applying the policies set out in the Local Plan?
3. Existing boundary fencing may have been suitable for the land in its previous state of being unoccupied, but should now be fit for purpose in containing activity within the developed property and address the concern of potential visual intrusion.
4. Assurances are required about the impact of the development on the stability of the sloping land next to the boundary.
5. Due to the high density of the proposed dwellings to be constructed and the influx in the high number of residents what consideration has been taken as to the capacity of public transport, doctors, hospitals, ambulance services, shops, pre-schools, primary and secondary schools etc to address their needs and the needs of existing residents?

The nature of the properties, resident population and demographic is relevant, particularly regarding external personal recreational space requirements, demand for and pressure on local services, particularly on top of a new increased capacity Hayshead Primary School.

6. How are service vehicles, such as garbage trucks, able to service the proposed development within the confines of the existing access including turning circle for heavy vehicles?

Clarification is required on how projected car and service vehicle parking and movement is compliant with local plan requirements.

7. Due to the high density of the proposed development how has the provision of public open space been addressed such as children's playgrounds, sport fields, dog walking etc?
8. What effect will the proposed development have on:
 - existing wild life and/or migratory paths of wild life?
 - existing vegetation and/or trees?
9. How are increased noise levels and/or loss of enjoyment etc as a result of the proposed development to be addressed for the neighbouring properties?
10. How is the site storage of building materials, rubbish etc. to be controlled during the build phase so as not to have any effect on the neighbouring properties?
11. Will the proposed development overshadow neighbouring properties?

At least as far as it relates to properties which sit below a severe down slope on the proposed development site, privacy issues might be addressed by a combination of retention of woodland on the development site, improved boundary fencing and privacy glass on upper floors of the proposed housing blocks.

12. What is the process of rectifying, reinstating, and recovering any loss due to any damage to the neighbouring properties if this was to occur?
13. What are the requirements of the landscaping/revegetation of the proposed development prior to final completion and/or any sign offs?
14. What, if any compliance/enforcement role will Angus Council have should the development not be maintained to standard?
15. Has the process underpinning the planning proposal been independently audited and assessed for compliance with:
 - the National Planning Framework
 - the Local Development Plan
 - Best practice as set out in relevant Scottish Government Planning Advice Notes (PANs), including PAN 81 on community engagement

Abbey Bank House application reference 30/00395/FULL - notice for serving on neighbours, 15 October 2020

I acknowledge receipt of the “*notice for serving on neighbours*” dated 15 October 2020 and the assurance provided that “*information [I] have provided in [my] representation will be used by Angus Council (the ‘data controller’) for the purposes of the Data Protection in order to determine the planning application*”

I object to the revised (October 2020) planning application.

I do so having reviewed all documents relating to this planning application on the Council’s portal, including responses from fellow residents. Of all the resident responses to date none support the planning application. Whilst I and my fellow residents raise a myriad of negative impacts they are grouped around recurring themes, amongst them:

- inadequate personal, social and recreational space for residents;
- local vehicle congestion, pedestrian and vehicle traffic safety;
- increased local noise and pollution;
- adverse impact on the character, amenity and pattern of developments of the surrounding area;
- loss of amenity and privacy of existing or future occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties;
- absence of a plan to protect and preserve mature woodland and local wildlife on the site;
- concern with potential destruction of neighbourhood residential property values.

The over-arching reality is that:

- ***none of the issues raised in previous objections have been addressed;***
- ***the October planning application is a deterioration in compliance with Council planning policies, deterioration in amenity for the local community and deterioration in boundary and privacy issues affecting neighbours;***
- ***this planning application proposes cramming a 20 unit housing development and medium sized village population onto a small scrap of land, and on balance is unlikely to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.***

None of the proposed changes, cosmetic nor substantive can detract from this limiting factor.

It is not necessary to re-litigate my specific objections, concerns and requests for clarification. These stand on their own merits, set out in my previous summary and detailed objection documents, structured around:

A diminished process

As constituted the process still lacks full transparency, is discriminatory and unreasonable, prohibiting or diminishing public engagement.

In the interests of transparent public reporting I trust that the Council will:

- demonstrate how the “*information [I and other residents] have provided in our representations have been used by Angus Council to determine the planning application*”;

- facilitate stakeholder attendance or representation at relevant Council committee meetings convened to deliberate this planning application, enabling stakeholders to observe, listen to arguments, to question and challenge as appropriate;
- *receive and consider a publicly available Chief Officer report which at a minimum helps to ensure and demonstrate that:*
 - *Council member decisions and actions around this application are not ultra vires, are based on relevant information, are reasonably and objectively determined and robustly grounded in relevant planning laws and regulations;*
 - *the inter-generational multiplicity of potentially adverse consequences of this development, should it proceed, have been subject to due diligence, scrutinised and assessed for compliance with Council policy and procedures, has had due regard to the National Planning Framework, the Local Development Plan and best practice, including those set out in relevant Scottish Government Planning Advice Notes (PANs).*

Specific concerns and points for clarification

As above, none of the points in my objection to the June application have been addressed and all stand in objection to this revised application.

I refer to my previous summary objection document and the more detailed objection document which sets out the specifics and nuance of my arguments. These are provided on the Council's planning portal.

Within this framework I have further specific observations and concerns following my document review. These are set out below.

Comparison of accommodation June 2020 - October 2020

	Accommodation	Beds	Persons		Accommodation	Beds	Persons
June 2020				October2020			
Block 1 North	2 houses	3	10	Block 1 North	8 flats	1	16
Block 2 North	2 houses	3	10	Block 2 South	4 flats	3	20
Block 3 South	4 flats	3	20	Block 3 South	4 flats	3	20
Block 4 South	8 flats	1	16	Block 4 South	8 flats	2	16
Block 5 South	4 flats	3	20				
			<u>76</u>				<u>72</u>

Although there has been a small reduction in density from 76 persons to 72 persons the south area has the same density, albeit with a different configuration of units.

The site remains unreasonably overdeveloped with a capacity population that is in itself greater than many villages across Scotland. I can only imagine that the population density with miniscule external recreational space would be physically and socially oppressive for most tenants.

Planning Policy **PV2** requires that a minimum of 2.43 hectares of open space per 1,000 head of population be provided. Based on a development population capacity of 72 persons this requires the developer to create 1,750 square metres of outdoor recreational space or 24.3 square metres per resident. Asserting that the nearby Springfield Park provides external recreational is disingenuous, is neither new open space nor personal to prospective new tenants but rather an existing community asset.

Open space provision is not made on this site in accordance with the relevant standard. The making of an alternative trivial financial contribution of £10,360 to general public and open space maintenance in the local authority area in lieu does nothing to offset the diminution in amenity caused by this development in its immediate locality. Accepting this contribution as an alternative way forward in the application for this development is unreasonable.

This development does not meet requirements in development policies and taken overall is an unreasonable diminution in the amenity and utility of the immediate locality as a place to live in, work in and visit.

More generally I am highly sceptical that this high density development is conducive to building a stable, sustainable and socially cohesive community, consistent with avoiding a deleterious impact on the wider community, for example in terms of its local character, stress on local roads, infrastructure and public services.

Privacy

In the June Plan the space to the southern boundary was patio and verge. This is replaced in the October Plan by car parking spaces and access road. It is highly likely that the car parking spaces and access road will be in far greater use by the residents.

In the October Plan Block 3 is closest to the boundary with Plot 2 (my property - 7 Springfield Terrace, referenced as "Springfield Brae" in site plans) at 17m from the unit doorway and 25m from the unit window line.

From perusal of the drawing I estimate the distance from my fence line to:

- unit windows at 20.25 metres (66 feet)
- car parking spaces at 11.5 metres (38 feet)
- access road at 6.75 metres (22 feet)

Changes to siting of residential units, mixed with running an access road and 12 car parking spaces along the southern boundary fence line set out in the October plan will by way of people and vehicle movement exacerbate intrusion to privacy at the Southern Boundary.

"Shuffling the pack" cannot mask the reality of an excessively dense housing development and cannot mitigate the miscellany of negative impacts that I and fellow residents have already communicated. Significantly there have been zero resident respondents who support the proposed development and a number have highlighted issues where the development fails to comply with Council planning policies.

I expect Council members to give appropriate weighting to this fact during their final deliberations on the merit of the planning application.

Further, it is incumbent on officers reporting to Council members to draw attention to all issues with the development which are not in accordance with the Council's policies and procedures.

It appears that Block 3's upper level elevation will look directly down into the rear bedroom of my property and into my rear garden. This will inevitably be an intrusion upon my amenity and privacy.

Potentially this intrusion of my personal privacy could be mitigated by:

- turning block 3 through 180 degrees so that the top elevation looks into the development and not into my house and into my rear garden;
- installation of privacy glass on higher elevation rear windows that ensure no visibility into my house and rear garden;
- installation of a sound proof wall or barrier along the line of the southern boundary car parking faces of appropriate quality, durability and height to ensure the development is not visible from plots 1, 2 and 3 and vice versa;
- requiring the retention, nurturing and development of the mature woodland on the steep downslope to plots 1 and 2 as a natural barrier, consistent with retaining its visual appeal and safeguarding wildlife.

Better still, if legal title of the area behind the line of the access road is ceded to homeowners of plots 1, 2 and 3 they can assume responsibility for maintenance of the wooded area going forward

southern boundary fence

The October plan remains the same as the June plan, retaining the existing fence. Refer again to my previous objection documents. The fence and mature woodland and undergrowth on the steep downslope (1 in 4 in places) has not been attended to by the site owners, the absence of care having almost certainly negatively impacted the condition and longevity of the southern boundary fence.

At a minimum it is reasonable to expect that the developer should replace this fencing to an appropriate standard and maximum height, consistent with Council planning policies and building regulations with maximum noise diminution value in the materials and construction technique used.

Proposed access road

The revised plan allows for demolition of "the lodge" (**is it listed?**) on Springfield Terrace and constructing an access road, exiting onto Springfield Terrace and running along the southern boundary fence line. The proposed access road brings additional unwelcome vehicles to the locality, creating a difficult/dangerous junction in terms of vehicular and pedestrian management.

I have not seen any evidence of a risk assessment and road traffic impact assessment having been carried out. That being said, in what universe is this a good idea? At best it is problematic, at worse recklessly negligent.

The proposed access road for 20 plus vehicles will be adjacent to the existing confluence of busy arterial roads, specifically Springfield Terrace/Seaton Road, Cliffburn Road and Hayshead Road. Currently:

- traffic on Seaton Road/Springfield Terrace is not easily sighted for traffic turning right from Hayshead Road onto Springfield Terrace or turning right from Cliffburn Road onto Seaton Road;
- Springfield Terrace can be characterised as a narrow busy arterial road, marked with double yellow lines running for hundreds of metres into the town centre and with multiple access/exit points. Yellow lines are important in maintaining a clearway with good visibility, consistent with maintaining safe flow of traffic in the locality;
- the proposed access road will cut across an existing busy but narrow pedestrian footpath and will lead to an unsafe traffic and pedestrian landscape within the locality.

From common sense, adding a new road into the mix simply invites risk of injury or worse to vehicle drivers and pedestrians and that as a minimum road traffic and pedestrian management infrastructure and calming will need to be constructed.

My substantive point is that at a minimum the Council and developer must conclusively demonstrate that they have thought this access road proposal through in terms of risks, road traffic impact etc. and designed appropriate measures to manage and mitigate negative impacts.

L E Cross

30 October 2020

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Linsey Burnett

Address: 6 Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Visual appearance and compatibility with surroundings

As can clearly be seen by the map extract on the planning letter sent to nearby residents, all adjacent properties and indeed all properties in the surrounding area are detached or semi detached dwelling houses. There are no blocks of flats at all nearby and it would not fit in with the neighbourhood character. All previous approved applications were for houses, and we did not object to any of these.

Road Safety, parking and access/Impact on traffic movements

The plans are not clear regarding parking capacity, I am concerned that there will not be sufficient parking capacity for 20 flats within this small site. Therefore I am concerned that this will affect surrounding roadways. There is no parking on Springfield Terrace, so the next available parking would be Hayshead Road. This is already a highly congested area which has an access to new primary school campus. I have professional experience of this, and am extremely concerned that this will lead to further congestion and compromise the safety of the children attending. The road junction at Hayshead Road/Springfield Terrace is already challenging and any increase in traffic especially large construction traffic would increase the likelihood of a road traffic accident. It is hard to see how the construction on the site could be carried out safely in these conditions.

Privacy and Amenity/Impact on adjacent property

The topography of the land, which is higher at the rear of our property means any building work has the potential to impact on the privacy of our house and garden area. A block of flats will only accentuate this issue, causing more concern regarding privacy. There is no clear indication of how the small area of land separating the development from our property will be filled. We have young children and are both employed in high risk occupations, items on our washing line require to be

private, as do our young children playing in the garden

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lorraine Stephen

Address: 3 Hayshead Road Arbroath DD115AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: My concerns are,

1 there is an adjoining door in the wall at the bottom of my property. I would like this built up in keeping with the rest of the wall so that there can be no access into my property.

2 I seen there was no windows on the side of the four houses on Hayshead Road I would hope this would be finalised as this so we can keep our privacy on our garden.

3 I would like to know what will be happening with all the trees as they support a lot of local wildlife. If possible I would like as many of them to stay. And will there be a sympathetic attempt to move local wildlife?

4 The state of the pavements on Hayshead Road are a disgrace I would hope Hillcrest could come to some agreement with the council to have these fixed.

5 As the street will be loosing more parking and the school being so near is there anything been put in place for parking? We as residents are already fed up of people parking in or over our driveways to pick up drop off at school.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lorraine Stephen

Address: 3 Hayshead Road Arbroath DD115AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I'm responding to the updated plans for the area around Abbeybank house in Arbroath. I see on the new plans that the houses planned for Hayshead Road side are now to be flats. Surely with the new school being built in the area and in keeping with the area the original plans for houses would be a better idea. Shouldn't we be encouraging family's into the area. Also Hayshead Road is a very busy road with parking/ traffic already and I feel like would just cause more upset with the neighbours already having to deal with this. I also see the bins now put near the road on Hayshead Road and if not managed properly will smell, and cause litter throughout the street. I certainly would prefer 4 houses rather than 8 flats also 16 bins instead of 32! If it were family houses it would also potentially reduce the cars dropping off at the school gates every day. On another point the 2 new accesses your intending to put in Springfield Terrace, along with the existing 2 will mean 4 Road accesses in a very short section of road. Surely that should then raise safety concerns or require traffic calming measures to what is already a tricky road/junction. I would also like to point out most of the residents around this area live in detached or semi detached houses and would like to see something similar built in the area. The wildlife is another issue, the trees in the proposed site house a lot of birds, there is deer, foxes, squirrels, bats to name a few. I would hope there would be a sympathetic attempt to try and keep as much trees as possible and move the wildlife in accordance.

Thankyou

Lorraine Stephen

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Nicola Owen

Address: Hayshead Road Arbroath DD11 5AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The wall on Hayshead Road should be restored to its original state as this was never an access to the site. With the removal of the wall this directly affects our property as the gable end forms part of the wall. If the wall is removed remedial work would be required to ensure the safety of our property to our satisfaction. Access to our gable end would have to be available at all times. The wall running down the side of our property would have to be renewed as the previous owners refused to manage the trees within the site and significant damage has occurred. The increase in traffic on Hayshead Road would cause concern in relation to the school. Also traffic into and out of the 4 properties is dangerous due to the closeness of the junction at Hayshead and Springfield. If the 4 proposed properties were turned 180 degrees access would be better through Springfield Terrace and no access from Hayshead Road

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Land Adjacent To Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Nicola Owen

Address: 1 Hayshead Road Arbroath DD11 5AZ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

1. My property has a significant amount of privacy which would be severely impacted with the erection of flats immediately overlooking my property
2. The increase in pollution from vehicles being allowed to park directly on the other side of the adjoining wall would feed into our property which could cause significant physical problems.
3. Noise pollution on my property from the proposed development will increase dramatically.
4. Hayshead Road currently has seen a significant increase in traffic due to the school and with the introduction of flats this would further increase the traffic and pollution directly around my property
5. The previous approved applications were for single storey properties only and this would be acceptable however access should be from Springfield Terrace and not Hayshead Road
6. The wall which has fallen down in parts should be returned to its original state with no access onto Hayshead Road
7. The refuse area is in close proximity to my property which could attract vermin having a direct impact on my standard of living, physical health and mental wellbeing
8. There are bats in the area and my understanding is they are protected species in Scotland.
9. With the previous application I had no objection to the 4 houses being built - only that they did not have access to Hayshead Road.
10. I would strongly object to the erection of flats adjacent to my property which would have a significant detrimental effect on my families physical health and wellbeing with the increase in pollution directly into my property and being overlooked 24/7.

Comments for Planning Application 20/00395/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/00395/FULL

Address: Abbeybank House Springfield Terrace Arbroath DD11 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 20 Affordable Homes with associated Landscaping, Access, Parking, Drainage and Infrastructure

Case Officer: Fraser MacKenzie

Customer Details

Name: William Stather

Address: Abbeybank house Springfield Terrace Arbroath Dd11 1el

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the application, being the owner occupier of Abbeybank house I have not received any notification regards this proposed development within my house former Gardens, I should have been notified but its clear from your list the developer has missed me out , very strange as this development would have the most impact on me??

The intended development will completely destroy the view we have learned to enjoy having lived here almost 20 years . If this proposed layout gets the green light we will look out our living room window at a large proposed bin area , Not considering just how ugly that could further decline. The impact on traffic at this intended access will be considerable as its an already busy junction as is!.