

Pauline E Chalmers

From: Graeme Carnegie
Sent: 31 July 2023 15:34
To: Pauline E Chalmers <ChalmersPE@angus.gov.uk>
Subject: 23/00149/FULL

Graeme Carnegie
Quarry Cottage
Waulkmills, St Vigeans
Arbroath, DD11 4RG

Dear Ms Chalmers

I write with reference to the above case.

I have seen the report by Roads and I am concerned about some of the comments within.

1. The previous hedge was nowhere near 9mtr high or 3 mtr in width.
2. None of the neighbours from the 4 properties served by this road, these being myself, [REDACTED] and the Ferrier from Waulkmill, have reported any damage to cars.
3. As this is not a road, under the terms of the 1988 Road Traffic Act, the Highway Code does not apply.
4. The report does not refer to the reduced access to No.2 Mount Pleasant caused by the fence being moved 1.2mtr east.
5. In the last paragraph of the report, the writer, Mr Barnes, mentions "it's impact on the public road network".
By doing so he is contradicting himself, he has already stated that it is an unadopted track.
6. Mr Barnes fails to take into consideration that there is a suitable Council public footpath adjacent and parallel our access road. Pedestrians, cyclists etc should make use of this instead, leaving the road for vehicles, as this is the only way to and from these properties.

However, at present, this path is almost impassable for cyclists and horse riders due to overhanging foliage because of lack of Council maintenance, causing them to use our "NARROW SINGLE FILE ROAD" instead.

Points 1 and 2 above are not true, this is again untruths submitted by the applicant. I have already mentioned several of these untruths contained within his Application.

In my opinion this report is flawed for the following reasons.

- A. There is no evidence of reports on damage to cars unless YOU CAN PROVE OTHERWISE.
- B. The size of hedge claimed by the Applicant is untrue, unless YOU CAN PROVE OTHERWISE.

C. There has been no site visit or consultation with the residents here by Mr. Barnes, instead has based his report on the UNTRUTHS submitted by the applicant.

D. Cyclists come round the blind corner at speed with no regard for other road users.

E. A consultant employed by a Council department can approve the actions of a private individual, who has disrupted and inconvenienced others, while the Council's own path is not kept in good order. (point 6 above)

I strongly object to this report being used in this case until a site visit by Roads, a consultation with affected residents has taken place and YOU PROVIDE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE to points 1 & 2 above.

Daniel Coleman stated on 11/8/22 "*line of sight is a material planning consideration and would be taken into account for any decision*" yet Mr Barnes states that the restriction is acceptable.

I have again attached *before and after* photos of the reduced sightline at the north end of the fence.



SLOW



Pauline E Chalmers

From: Graeme Carnegie

Sent: 20 August 2023 09:11

To: ROADS <ROADS@angus.gov.uk>; Mike Ferrier ; Anne jamie Mclean ; Pauline E Chalmers <ChalmersPE@angus.gov.uk>

Cc: Andy Barnes <BarnesA@angus.gov.uk>; Adrian G Gwynne <GwynneAG@angus.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Davids Hill, Waukmill 23/00149/FULL Memorandum CH/AGG/ TD1.3

Dear Ms Chalmers

In response to your email of 4th August I am forwarding the following to demonstrate the hazard created by the high fence, moved out from it's original position, thereby making a blind corner beyond David's Hill at the bridge over the Brothock water.

As you are unable to open the sent video file, others copied in managed to do so, the screenshot shows a woman with a pram and a loose dog in the middle of the road.

I had sounded my horn 5 seconds prior to this, beside the portable toilet, traveling at 15mph but she was totally oblivious to my approach.

Again I state, had this been someone unfamiliar with the area, the outcome could have been different.

The other 2 photos show a skid mark on the grass verge just over the bridge, an incident which occurred on the afternoon of Friday 18th August which I witnessed.

A delivery van came from the south, going north over the bridge at speed.

2 cyclists, compete with cycling gear, helmets, shorts etc were travelling 2 abreast, going south, at a decent speed.

The van then had to brake sharply to avoid a collision, skidding onto the grass verge.

The driver was lost, Google Maps had taken him this way to go to Letham Grange.

As I have said before, we have no control over the actions of others and an accident is going to happen sometime.

Another factor in this is that there is an adjacent footpath (disused railway line which runs parallel and adjacent to our road) owned by the Council, paid for by the taxpayer, for pedestrians and cyclists to use without interfering with the passage of vehicles using the "road".

The highway code (as Mr Barnes likes to quote from) states that those on foot should use a FOOTPATH where there is one.

Unfortunately Angus Council are unable to maintain this footpath in a serviceable condition, despite a request from me, (confirmed in an email from David Graham, Parks Services Manager, 3rd August) due to it being obstructed by overhanging branches and large muddy puddles thereby forcing pedestrians and cyclists to use our road.

Therefore I conclude that Angus Council are adding to the hazard by not fulfilling their obligations.

I trust these factors will be considered in your decision.

Regards

Graeme Carnegie



T50 SKC 11:41:23 20/07/2023





10

From: Graeme Carnegie [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2023 21:37
To: PLANNING <PLANNING@angus.gov.uk>
Subject: Application Ref 23/00149/FULL

Graeme Carnegie
[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern

I have tried to submit an objection to the above application via Public Access but on submission I got an error message "timeout" and lost everything I had written. I had a similar problem when trying to send information to Daniel Coleman last month.

I understand that objections must be submitted by 30th March.
My status is "member of the public" but actually a neighbour beyond the 20 mtrs.

I trust you will accept my objection by submitting this email as follows -:

I am objecting because I am a neighbour who has to pass this fence as it is the only route to my property.

The fence does not follow the original line as the applicant claims.

The original line had been in place for 38 years without problems.

There has been no complaints of cars being scratched, I have consulted the other neighbours.

Sightlines have been restricted at the south end of the fence by being moved 1.2m further east, making access and egress restricted at No.2 Mount Pleasant, 0.5m further east along the straight section to the entrance to David's Hill and at the north end near the bridge over Brothock Water where it "dog legs" out at 2 positions narrowing the road and obstructing vision of oncoming traffic, cyclists and walkers.

As such the use of car horns has become necessary, to which the Applicant has complained to Police.

A Traffic Officer has confirmed that this practice may continue.

The narrowing of the road has caused failure of the tarmac surface caused by large vans having to move over to prevent mirrors striking fence.

This development was first reported in April 2021 but the then Enforcement Officer (Chic Colvin) resigned, again in August, where it was mistakenly filed as "Case Closed" and again in Jan 2022 when the mistake was discovered,

Not "a year later" as the applicant claims. Angus Council have received several photos and date stamped videos of "before, during and after" demonstrating the above points.

There are several incorrect claims in the application, on the forms and drawings.

There is no "Public Car Park", no "Council Garages", there is only one, privately owned by No.1 Mount Pleasant, erected many years ago.

The land between the east side of the private road and wall of the disused railway (Nature Trail) was part of Letham Grange Estate, never has been "Council Land"

Part of the curtilage of No.2 Mount Pleasant has been shaded out in black, where their garage is, and also claimed as "Council Land"

On the Application Form the site has been declared as "Residential" where in fact a business activity is being conducted there evident by the advertising sign, portable toilet, cafeteria and shop and being described on Google Maps as a "Farm". Also as goats are being kept in the garden, the premises should be in possession of a County Parish Holding (CPH) number. This has not been declared on the form.

Given that there is so much incorrect information here I am at a loss to understand why this application has even been "Validated".

Please acknowledge receipt of this email and if submission in this way, given the tech gremlins striking again, is acceptable.

Kind Regards

Graeme Carnegie

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Kay Ferrier

Address: Waulkmills St. Vigeans Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object on the following grounds:

SAFETY

The fence as erected

a) blocks previously clear sight lines thus endangering all users of our private shared road , particularly pedestrian , horse riders and cyclists.

b) encroaches by some distance beyond the line of the previous fence thus narrowing the shared private road and thereby impeding access by emergency vehicles eg Fire & Rescue and farm vehicles

The above grounds and most of the errors below are evidenced by the 'Before and After' photographs currently held by Angus Council.

ERRORS IN APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

i. New fence did not 'replace a hedge of approx. 9m high & 3m wide '(dimensions exaggerated)

ii. Neighbours did not complain about 'the hedging scratching cars & poor visibility of the access road'

iii. New fence does not 'provide safer access road & more visibility'

iv. Any branches blocking the road came from [REDACTED] trees not [REDACTED] hedge

v. New fencing does not 'increase visibility'; quite the opposite.

vi. On the Location Plan the new fence is shown as being within the curtilage of the [REDACTED] property. This is incorrect. The original fence defined the edge of the [REDACTED] curtilage. The new fence extends by some distance from the line of the previous fence and thereby

a. is located beyond the curtilage of the [REDACTED] property ,and

b. encroaches onto the shared private road

vii. On the Location Plan the road to the north is designated 'Out to Colliston /Letham Grange Road. This is incorrect. The road/track to the north is a 'No Through Road' from which access to only four private dwellings is gained.

viii. On the Location & Proposed Plans a Car Park is shown. There is neither a car park nor space for one.

OTHER

The new fence abuts a private shared road. Consequently the 'No objection ' by 'Roads' is irrelevant as Roads have no jurisdiction . (Such blocked sight lines would not be permitted on a single track road over which Roads did have jurisdiction.)

Subject:

From: Michael Ferrier

Sent: 26 July 2023 17:56

To: Pauline E Chalmers <ChalmersPE@angus.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: David's Hill, Waulkmill 23/00149/FULL

Dear Ms Chalmers

I note that the response from Roads states

The application seeks to regularise the erection of a 1.8 metres high fence built to replace a hedge boundary of approximately 3 metres in width and 9 metres in height which was supplemented by an original fence. The applicant explains that neighbours had been complaining about branches of the hedging scratching cars and poor visibility of the access track. It is claimed that the new fence provides a safer access route with increased visibility.

The 1.8 m fence has been erected to replace a wattle fence of c. 1m high (see attached photo). The statement highlighted by me in yellow is **WRONG**

As can be seen from the attached photo

- The existing hedge was certainly **nowhere near** 9 metres high nor 3 metres in width
- There was no danger of branches of the hedging scratching cars. Hence there have been no such complaints
- The visibility **before** the erection of the 1.8m m fence was much better than **after** its erection. (see attached photos)

In my view Roads, in making their 'no objection' comment are completely in the **WRONG** by relying on the (deliberately) **UNTRUE** information supplied by the applicant (highlighted by me in blue)

It is also unfortunate that Roads made no site visit nor considered the **FACTS** .

In light of the above I hereby object to this matter being considered further until Roads have made a site visit and taken statements from the affected neighbours. (This would be equitable as Roads have obviously taken account of only the applicant's **UNTRUTHFUL** input.)

Michael G Ferrier

Waulkmills

St. Vigeans

Arbroath

DD11 4RG

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Ferrier

Address: Waulkmills St. Vigeans Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object on the following grounds:

SAFETY

The fence as erected

a) blocks previously clear sight lines thus endangering all users of our private shared road , particularly pedestrians and cyclists.

b) encroaches by some distance beyond the line of the previous fence thus narrowing the shared private road and thereby impeding access by emergency vehicles eg Fire & Rescue

The above grounds and most of the errors below are evidenced by the 'Before and After' photographs currently held by Angus Council.

ERRORS IN APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

i. New fence did not 'replace a hedge of approx. 9m high & 3m wide '(dimensions exaggerated)

ii. Neighbours did not complain about 'the hedging scratching cars & poor visibility of the access road'

iii. New fence does not 'provide safer access road & more visibility'

iv. Any branches blocking the road came from [REDACTED] trees not [REDACTED] hedge

v. New fencing does not 'increase visibility'

vi. On the Location Plan the new fence is shown as being within the curtilage of the [REDACTED] property. This is incorrect. The original fence defined the edge of the [REDACTED] curtilage. The new fence extends by some distance from the line of the previous fence and thereby

a. is located beyond the curtilage of the applicant's property ,and

b. encroaches onto the shared private road

vii. On the Location Plan the road to the north is designated 'Out to Colliston /Letham Grange Road'. This is incorrect. The road/track to the north is a 'No Through Road' from which access to only four private dwellings is gained.

viii. On the Location & Proposed Plans a Car Park is shown. There is neither a car park nor space

for one.

OTHER

The new fence abuts a private shared road, (the upkeep cost is borne by adjacent residents, including the applicant). Consequently the 'No objection ' by 'Roads' is irrelevant as Roads have no jurisdiction . (Such blocked sight lines would not be permitted on a single track road over which Roads did have jurisdiction.)

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Miss Danielle McWalter

Address: 3a Fisheracre Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am a horse rider who regularly hacks along the road at David's Hill, the fence in question has been renewed at some point during the last few years and what a difference it has made especially at the bend beside the bridge, the whole road seems to be a lot clearer and safer. The fence to me appears to be in the same position as the old one but is a bit higher I think and less trees which appears to open the view of the road up. I have heard a certain few are objecting to it as they say it's dangerous because it blocks the view of oncoming traffic. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I now always ride with a video device mounted on my helmet for evidence, just in case, on the advice of the police.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Miss S Carnegie

Address: Kirkton road Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As a frequent user of the road, requiring access to the land at Waulkmills to tend to horses, I object to this application.

The original fence offered a better visibility to the road users due to it being further back from the road and lower in height.

The new fence is taller and has been moved further out from the curtilage of the property, causing blind spots on the road. The line of sight has diminished, often causing near misses with other road users.

A number of people use the road including walkers, cyclists, horse riders, farmer and other residents, as well as Royal Mail and delivery drivers. In addition to this, the number of road users has also increased with the presence of the Alpaca Trekking and shop, witching the curtilage of the property.

Furthermore, there are inaccuracies and over exaggeration of information contained within the application which have been highlighted by other commenters.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jamie Mclean

Address: 2 Mount Pleasant, Letham Mill, St Vigeans Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Objection on the following grounds:

1. A catalogue of errors in the applicant's submission:

- The new fence did not 'replace a hedge of approx. 9m x 3m (clearly exaggerated). This 'hedge' was behind the initial fence line.
- The new fence does not 'provide a safer access road' nor 'increase visibility' as detailed below.
- On the Location Plan & Proposed Plans the applicant has indicated 2 ex council garages. There are No and has Never been council garages. One of the garages highlighted is on our property and the other is privately owned.
- On the Location & Proposed Plans a car park is shown. There is neither a car park nor space for one.
- The application states no complaints made until a year after fence was erected. [REDACTED]. Reports were first made in April 2021.

2. Safety Issues.

The new fence:

- Blocks a previously clear line of sight thus endangering all users of our private shared road both in vehicles and pedestrians including dog walkers and horse riders.
- Impinges beyond the previous fence towards the road by some distance resulting in the narrowing of the shared private road

which also impacts access to and from our property of large vehicles. E.g., the tanker used to empty our septic tank can no longer enter the property due to no turning room.

Angus council hold photographs of the fence before, during and after erection clearly showing this fence being moved towards the road.

3. Other notable points

- Query why applicant has indicated there is parking for 20 vehicles. Normally 5 vehicles on the property. The application states use of land as Residential. Is the parking for 20 vehicles related to the Enforcement notice of the Alpaca trekking business on this site (Ref.No: 22/00010/UNUSE).

From:jamie annie mclean
Sent:11 Apr 2023 21:32:30 +0100
To:Daniel Coleman
Cc:Pauline E Chalmers
Subject:Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Hi Daniel,

I am emailing in regard to the Planning application 23/00149/FULL with the proposal of a
Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House, of which the case officer is Pauline Chalmers who I have copied into this email.

I want to contradict the details on the comment made by Mrs Diane Haxton, on the 9th April 2023 in regards to the fence erected on our property. The comment states there was recently another fence erected on opposite side of road, this fence has been extended over the verge & has effectively reduced the ability to pull into that side for approaching traffic. This has never been questioned or subjected to the same complaints or scrutiny. This was not the case. Prior to erecting our fence, we sought permission from planning to which a planning officer visited the site. Permission was granted as long as we kept the fence to its original height and put back on the exact same footprint of the existing fence which is well within our land boundary. This was all backed up with photographic evidence and done prior to erecting the fence and not done retrospectively therefore why the fence was not subject to the same complaints or scrutiny. Furthermore, the fence in question at Davids Hill which has been moved in closer to the road has reduce the ability to pull in for approaching traffic and not our fence.

Also, the statement regarding the fence being moved out 10 years ago without incident is simply untrue. The photographic evidence previously submitted shows the position on the old and new fence.

Kind regards

Jamie and Anne Mclean

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigean's Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mr William Macrae

Address: 26 Warddykes Avenue Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I was a professional class 1 hgv driver for over 40 years before I retired.

I have read these objections regarding the fence that was renewed at David's Hill and I felt obligated to set a few inaccuracies by these objectors right.

I have driven that road at David's Hill right through to Firhill when I was a young lad, this was never a private road it has always been an access road. Some [REDACTED] person put up big gates across the road so you can no longer get through.

I have also parked my car in the small carpark which had been there since probably before I was born, it was only big enough for 3 cars side by side but it was a great spot right on the actual nature trail there was a wooden fence at the front so you didn't drive into the burn I think it was put up by the council because someone actually did. The fence is still there but the space where you could park is gone, someone put up an ugly metal fence and I noticed the road is either raised or the hard standing has been dug down but that must have been done at the time the metal fence was erected, as to look at it now you wouldn't realise one had ever been there.

The most concerning inaccuracy is that the replacement fence in question is a hazard and it makes the road dangerous to drive as it blocks the view of the road users. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Diane Haxton

Address: 26 Warddykes Avenue Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: When I was young my dad used to take our family to nature trail at David's Hill, he would park his car in carpark opposite bridge on the trail. I have frequently used this access road, carpark & trail for 65 years. The carpark is no longer there as approx 15 years ago [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] erected metal post & wire fence over access point & put private road sign at end of road. I complained to Angus Council & was told they would investigate but nothing happened.

This road used to take you right through Letham Grange up past what locals called the bleaches and continued to the main road at Firhill.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The fence in question was moved out approximately 10 yrs ago without incident & has since been renewed in the same position. It enhances look of the road & doesn't restrict view or access of road unlike [REDACTED] fence which has taken away the passing place the carpark space used to provide at the bend.

There was recently another fence erected on opposite side of road, this fence has been extended over the verge & has effectively reduced the ability to pull into the side for approaching traffic. This fence has never been questioned or subjected to the same complaints or scrutiny [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I use this road daily basis on foot, SUV & horses & have the exact same experience I've always had before & after [REDACTED] with exception No carpark or access through Letham Grange [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Diane Parry

Address: 7 Forbes Place Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to this planning application on the following grounds:

SAFETY. The height of the fence erected is 1.8 metres and is nearer to the road than the fence and hedge it replaced. Due to the curve of the road the new fence reduces the sight-lines previously enjoyed causing significant increase in danger for those using the road which include motorists, pedestrians (including children and dog walkers) cyclists and horse riders.

ACCESS. Moving the fence nearer to the road has reduced the available width for larger vehicles including farm vehicles; delivery vehicles and emergency service vehicles, with the potential implications if emergency service vehicles are unable to gain access along the road.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Emma Walker

Address: 36 Hill Street Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I use this road quite a bit as I do deliveries in this area and have found this road a lot safer since this fence has been built as the road appears more clearer as the trees and bushes that were there previously restricted the view and I had to drive at a much slower pace. After reading previous comments [REDACTED] I felt the need to comment [REDACTED] [REDACTED] I have seen many vehicles use this road with ease since the fence has been built including council bin lorries, delivery lorries, tractors and even an ambulance. I for one think this fence is a great additional to the area as it has made my job a lot easier and I feel safer using the road without having to worry about the tall trees obstructing my view.

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Ms Clara Carnegie

Address: Holly Bank Cottage Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As a frequent user of the road, requiring access to the land at Waulkmills to tend to horses, I object to this application.

The Fence is a Hazard and there is a concern for the safety of all users of the road.

The fence has increased in height & moved outwards from the original line, up to 1.2m in some places, narrowing the road. The fence is of hit & miss type. All the above contribute to the reduced visibility beyond either side of the entrance at David's Hill, causing hazards for road users.

Most road users adhere to sensible speeds on the road, visitors & customers to David's Hill and the Alpaca Trekking & Shop do not, often meeting other road users, a potential to cause an accident. The mirror at the entrance of the property does not provide good visibility either side of the entrance where the fence encroaches onto the road (for those leaving the property). Be advised that Posties (Royal Mail), Delivery Drivers etc all use this road as well.

The road is used by walkers, cyclists & horse riders all of whom are at risk of harm because of the diminished line of sight caused by the fence. I've nearly been hit by oncoming traffic.

The lateral move of the fence has also caused difficulties with farm machinery, such as tractors & forklifts, which also utilise the road.

Errors and Incorrect information provided on the application have already been pointed out to the case worker on a previous objection.

From: Scott Ferrier<[REDACTED]>
Sent: 30 March 2023 17:11
To: PLANNING <PLANNING@angus.gov.uk>
Subject: 23/00149/FULL

Hello,

I want to object to the above application. I tried to do this via your portal but it didn't work. Please kindly acknowledge safe receipt.

The reasons for objecting are:

The Applicant's [REDACTED] is in the wrong place.

The current fence does not follow the original boundary he replaced. To the north of the entrance to David's Hill, [REDACTED] at the expense of the access road's width.

I can't see past the Applicant's [REDACTED]

The current fence has significantly reduced the ability to see a safe distance either way when driving along the curved access road which passes David's Hill.

The Applicant's [REDACTED] and the public.

The Applicant [REDACTED] is adjacent to an Angus Council public car park. There is no such car park. If there was, the above issue relating to diminished sight lines would bear greater significance and the Roads Department should be asked to re-evaluate the application.

The Applicant [REDACTED] is for the benefit of his neighbours in that the access road's safety and visibility are improved, and that scratches to cars are reduced. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I am unaware of any such historical complaints by the neighbours.

Kind regards,

Scott Ferrier

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 23/00149/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 23/00149/FULL

Address: David's Hill Waulkmill St Vigeans Arbroath DD11 4RG

Proposal: Retrospective Replacement Fence on East Boundary of House

Case Officer: Pauline Chalmers

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sonia Carnegie

Address: Quarry Cottage Waulkmills, St.Vigeans Arbroath

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This is the only way to and from my house.

The sightlines have been restricted at the bridge over the Brothock Water, where the fence dog legs out at 2 positions making the road narrower and opposite No.2 Mount Pleasant, where the fence has been moved out 1.2m closer to the edge of the tarmac creating a hazard for oncoming vehicles pedestrians and cyclists.

Several [REDACTED] claims have been submitted [REDACTED].

The fence does not follow the original line as claimed by the applicant, photos and videos sent to the Council clearly show this.

There is no "public car park"

There are no "council garages"

Part of the curtilage of No.2 Mount Pleasant has been drawn in as "Council Land" where their garage is.

The road does not go to Letham Grange and Colliston, it is a dead end at Waulkmill gate.

The property is described as residential where in fact a busy Alpaca farm operates from with the road being busy with visiting cars especially at weekends (again refer to restrictions of sightlines at Mount Pleasant above) and is described on google maps as a "FARM" with shop and portable toilet sited.

The site does not have parking spaces for 20 cars. Why does a residential property require this?

The previous fence line provided clearer visibility and had been there since 1984 without any problems.