

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: angela heap

Address: 18 south kinloch street carnoustie dd7 7hp

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Carnoustie does not need any more housing!! The infrastructure of this small town cannot cope! Impossible to get doctors appointment etc. Also our green spaces are getting destroyed and multiple trees disappearing. Why is prime agricultural land being used to cram MORE houses in? These outlying homes won't contribute to Carnoustie's economy either and won't use local retail outlets. My main objection is the destruction of our countryside, especially regarding global warming.

Murray Agnew (Case Officer)
Team Leader (Development Standards Planning)
Place Directorate
Angus Council
Angus House
Orchard Business Park
Forfar
DD8 1AN



17th August 2021

Dear Murray,

21/00557/FULL | Erection of 29 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure | Site At Greenlawhill Farm Greenlaw Terrace Barry

21/00558/FULL | Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure | Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Introduction and Executive Summary

We have assessed the above applications and submit comments on behalf of Kirkwood Homes Limited to both as follows. Please note that this submission is a formal objection to both applications and therefore should be acknowledged for each as such.

Together, both application areas at 3.2 ha amount to the total land included within Angus Local Development Plan (LDP) allocation “C4 Opportunity Site – Greenlaw Hill”.

The C4 allocation is identified as one site within the LDP and lists appropriate requirements should an application for planning permission be forthcoming. These include the need to reflect the rural setting, access arrangements and a landscaping scheme to provide an appropriate town edge and enhancement and linkages to the green network.

Rather than submitting a comprehensive single planning application, which seeks to address the above requirements, the applicants have chosen, without providing any appropriate contextual justification, to split the site into 2 separate applications. The only reason for doing this appears to be to circumvent a proper pre-application consultation process that would be required as a single application would be in excess of 2 hectares and 50 houses, be classed as a major application and require appropriate pre-application consultation.



With the background of allocation and site sensitivity, the Council would no doubt prefer to see a comprehensive application for the entire LDP allocation to be assured of appropriate pre-application consultation with the community, comprehensive design and assurance of delivery. It remains odd therefore that all the submitted documents, including the Design Statement and the Transport Statement analyse the site as one entity, however the site has been split into two separate applications. There is no logical reason from a planning policy / analysis, design or technical point of view to split the site into two applications and the only reason must be to circumvent the proper consultation process.

Background / Planning History

A previous application for residential planning permission, 16/00075/FUL, was refused by Angus Council on 2nd June 2021 as “*The development is contrary to Policy S3 of the Angus Local Plan Review (2009) because the proposed density and design of the development would not fit in with the local landscape character and pattern of development*”. The application was for 46 houses on the western part of the LDP C4 opportunity site. The appeal was also subsequently dismissed, the reasons for which are highlighted below.

Within this context, again the Council would no doubt wish to see a comprehensive application for the entire LDP allocation to be assured of comprehensive design / delivery. Indeed, all the submitted documents, which support both applications are exactly the same and cover both sites including the Design Statement and the Transport Statement which clearly analyse the site as one entity. There is therefore no logical reason from a planning policy / analysis, design or technical point of view to split the site into 2 applications. The only reason can be to circumvent the aforementioned proper consultation process and seek to fast track the application to determination.

LDP ‘C4’ Allocation Requirements

“Development should reflect the rural setting and open nature of the site, and its prominence at the entrance to Carnoustie on the Upper Victoria Link Road”.

Comment: As would be expected, when dismissing the previous appeal (PPA-120-2042), the Reporter flagged up this LDP requirement; the Reporter commenting that on this site, standard house types would pay little respect to the setting of the village and would not respect the open rural character of the area. In addition, the Reporter noting that little effort had been made to produce a landscaping scheme appropriate to a town edge which was required by the LDP C4 opportunity site briefing, also involving enhancement to and linkages with the green network. The Report therefore finding that a standard mainstream developer layout, density and house type approach to the site was not appropriate. In this regard it should be noted, as was highlighted by the Reporter, that this site is not in Carnoustie, where one might expect a more mainstream approach to housing layouts, it is in Barry where the traditional house type and lower density of the village should be respected, as should the landscape setting of this prominent site. Despite the submission of a Design Statement, the



proposals now submitted do little to address these issues and are contrary to LDP policy DS3.

“Vehicular access arrangements will be from the Upper Victoria Link Road”.

Comment: The previous Reporter highlighted the difficulties with the access which would likely result in the loss of verge and hedgerow on the north side, which has to be retained in the interests of safeguarding the rural character of the area and the existing wildlife habitats. Albeit these new proposals seek to retain the hedge, that is less than sure from the submitted information, a point rightly flagged up by the first objector to the applications (Mr Hugh McKenzie).

A landscaping scheme providing an appropriate town edge will be required including consideration of the enhancement and linkages to the green network.

Comment: As above, the proposals do little, if anything at all, to address the issue of landscape impact. Whilst the hedgerow to the north of the site is proposed for retention, and the ownership / control of this should of course be proven, the simple fact is that the developer is seeking to maximise the development footprint and is not proposing to provide an appropriate landscape setting as this would result in significant ‘on site’ landscaping along the sites northern boundary. A preferable approach would be to pull the building line back from this boundary and provide an appropriate physical and visual buffer in accordance with the LDP requirement.

Information Requirements

The overall Masterplan purports to *“bring forward the concept diagram as a formal layout and helps to illustrate how the plots will be delivered...”*. With all due respect, it does not do this in sufficient detail and there are no actual detailed development layouts submitted with the applications that can be scaled for accuracy and a proper interpretation of the proposals.

There is no Drainage Assessment submitted with the applications. Noting the background associated with drainage capacities and issues in Barry and the west side of Carnoustie, Drainage Impact Assessments should be required to be submitted and suitably assessed.

There is no Landscape Assessment submitted with the applications. Noting the above LDP requirement for *“a landscaping scheme providing an appropriate town edge”* such assessments should be submitted and suitably assessed. Notwithstanding, one might therefore expect that the landscape setting had been assessed within the Design Statement; however the aerial views from the north merely seek to demonstrate the lack of consideration and appropriate treatment of this northern approach into the town, i.e. as required by the LDP.

There is no Ecological Assessment submitted with the applications. Noting the location and land use characteristics of the site and its boundaries and for consistency of approach, such an assessment must be a requirement.



There is no Archaeological Assessment submitted with the applications. Noting the clear archaeological history in the area and for consistency of approach, such an assessment must be a requirement.

There is no Energy Statement submitted with the applications and for consistency of approach this should be a requirement.

In comparison, **Application 21/00523/FULM Panbride Road, Carnoustie**, i.e. also a current full application for residential development in the Carnoustie / Barry South Angus Housing Market Area; the list of documents requested by the Case Officer and agreed as appropriate for full consideration of such an application for planning permission was as follows:

- Location Plan (1:1250)
- Topographical Survey and Existing Features (1:500)
- Site Layout Plan (1:500)
- Additional site layouts (Overall phasing, specific phasing plans etc)
- Waste Management Plans (1:500)
- Green Area Plans and Pedestrian Core Paths
- Development Sectional Key Plan / Sectional Elevations
- Development Material Elevations
- House Type Elevations (1:50 & 1:100)
- Boundary Treatment Plans
- Boundary Treatment Details
- (1:500 for main plan and then 2no 1:200/250 for detailed layouts)
- Site Image / Axonometric
- Car Parking Provision & Cycle Storage
- Private Garden Ground Schedule
- Energy Statement
- House Type SAP's
- Car Parking Schedule
- Landscaping Layout
- Existing landscape feature to be retained / removed
- Schedule of open space and amenity spaces
- Archaeological Assessment
- Tree Survey
- Ecological Assessment
- Supporting Planning Statement
- PAC Report
- Design and Access Statement
- Indicative levels
- Roads Layout (kerbing, swept paths analysis for refuse vehicle / HGV, visibility splays, levels, details, adoption plan)
- Sewer Layout
- Transport Assessment / Statement
- Drainage Assessment / Strategy
- RSA

As referenced above, many of these documents are missing from both applications which, whilst sufficient for registration, are therefore deficient in the information



required to make a proper assessment of the proposals. The further assessments should therefore be provided in advance of any determination of the applications.

Whilst it is at the discretion of the Council to request appropriate supporting information, consistency of approach for similar applications is crucial to allow for confidence in the system and fair treatment of applications. However, we appreciate that these requests for further information may well be in hand and further supporting information may be added to the portal. If further information is added, that information should be advertised with a further 3 week consultation period for third party representations as appropriate.

Technical Matters

Drainage Infrastructure

Although the layouts for each phase show a hatched area for an indicative SuDS basin location, supporting conceptual drainage plans with a SuDS basin design have not been submitted with either application. If SuDS basins are to be proposed, these would of course also require surface water outfall routes. Neither application however contains a surface water outfall route within the proposals and the submitted topographical survey drawing (4146/SD/01) does not make reference to any watercourses on site. It should be questioned if any outfall route would therefore be within the submitted redline boundary.

Sewers for Scotland 4 also refers to the need to provide a surface water design that replicates as closely as possible the natural, i.e. undeveloped, run-off pattern from the site. There is of course a need to consider surface water disposal at an early stage in the development layout, with sufficient space for appropriate SuDS being provided when the layout is developed. There may of course be alternative measures proposed, however in accordance with Scottish Water Surface Water Policy where surface water disposal options are to be considered in order of preference; in each case justification must be provided to show why an option has been dismissed before the next option is considered.

Scottish Water stick rigidly to the guidance in the Surface Water Policy and Sewers for Scotland 4 and their stance has been backed by their legal team. It is therefore respectfully questioned whether these applications can be delivered technically and inline with Scottish Water Policy.

Proposed Levels

We note that a Topographical Survey and Street Elevations have been submitted with each of the applications. However, there are no proposed plot levels within either application pack and without designed plot levels, the proposed Street Elevations cannot of course be accurately representative. In the case of the submitted Street Elevations, they are presented with no level change across the elevation. For instance, the Indicative Street Elevation 2 within drawing 'Typical Street Elevations Phase 2' is shown as having no level change but the Topographical Survey indicates a 4-meter level change in this location running north to south. Without these design



levels, the proposals as presented in the applications do not therefore correctly represent the final development and must be disregarded.

Summary

- The phase 1 application (1.8015 ha) is for 29 houses, including 8 affordable (27.5%). The phase 2 application (1.4977 ha) is for 28 houses including 6 affordable (21.4%). Total 27 units including 14 affordable (24.5%). If phase 2 were therefore to be developed first or in isolation then there would be a significant shortfall in the delivery of the overall affordable housing requirement. This is just another example as to why there should be one overall application covering the entire planning unit.
- Each application appears to purposely have less than 50 units and less than 2ha in size.
- Both applications combined equate to 3.2992 ha (1.8015 ha and 1.4977 ha) and comprise 57 residential units. Applications for residential purposes involving the construction of 50 or more houses, or where the site exceeds 2 hectares are classed as ‘Major’ (Circular 5/2009). Therefore if submitted as one application the submission would then be classed as a major application.
- Major developments require pre-application consultation with communities and information on that is provided in Circular 3/2013. The Circular confirms that a prospective applicant must provide the planning authority with a ‘Proposal of Application Notice’ at least 12 weeks prior to the submission of an application for a major development and carry out appropriate pre-application public consultation with the community, including a formal consultation event. The purpose of splitting the application was solely to avoid the 12-week PoAN process and the scrutiny of the required community consultation. The community consultation of course leading to more community awareness of the proposals and more likelihood that there would be community interest and objection at the application stage which may well lead to the application having to be determined by Committee. With less community awareness, there may well be insufficient objection or no Councillor intervention and the application could be dealt with by way of a delegated decision.
- Both sites combined also equate to Angus LDP opportunity site C4 Greenlaw Hill (3.2 ha). The expectation would therefore be that the allocated site would be assessed in detail through a comprehensive application for planning permission; the LDP requiring that due to its “*prominence at the entrance to Carnoustie, a landscaping scheme providing an appropriate town edge will be required including consideration of the enhancement and linkages to the green network*”.
- There is no tangible reason why the LDP opportunity site has been split into 2 applications. Both applications are within the allocated site; both share the same access; both share the same ‘design concept’; and both require the same landscaping scheme. Both applications include the same Masterplan; both applications include the same Design Statement; both applications include the same Transport Statement. Indeed, the Transport Statement confirms that all discussions with Angus Councils Roads Officers have been on the basis of one site with 57 units on it, not two sites and not two separate terms of reference for the sites being split into two phases. As way of further certainty of this approach, in its conclusion, the Transport Statement references “*the proposed development of 57 housing units*”.



- Pre-application notification is a statutory requirement for developments that are categorised as a major. The clear aim of the process is to improve the planning system by strengthening the involvement of communities at an early stage to better reflect local views on proposed developments of this scale. The splitting of the LDP into 2 smaller applications is a clear attempt by the applicants to purposefully circumvent this process and not allow for full community consultation on the proposals. In effect, the applicants have put the Council and the community in a difficult position as they are seeking to fast track the applications to early determination without appropriate consultation as should be required for an allocated site of this scale which has specific LDP requirements.
- The above listed technical information requirements require clarification before any further consideration of the applications.

We would be grateful if you could acknowledge timeous receipt of these objections to both applications.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Ewan A Maclean MRTPI

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Ian Noble

Address: 9 Westfield Place Carnoustie Dd77ld

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:I object to planning being granted for 28 houses on this piece of land along with the first proposal planning number 21/00557/full.Again my reason are for the detrimental effect to wildlife ,flowers and fauna on the site and it's detrimental effect to the surrounding area.Also concerns for drainage ,schools,health centre etc as they are already at or nearing full capacity.

J L Fairfoot
38 Ramsay Street
Monifieth
DD5 4AQ

Planning Department

Angus Council

Forfar



15.08.21

Dear Mr Agnew,

21/00557/FULL & 21/00558/FULL: Both at Greenlaw Terrace, Barry, Carnoustie

I am writing to register my objection to the above applications. This letter should therefore be recorded as objections to both applications.

As someone who is very aware of the environment, I've read about how developers have to be more responsible and build houses to more environmentally acceptable standards. Yet, there is no statement as to the energy efficiency of the proposed houses and whether they will be of passive house construction. On the same theme, you would expect an open greenfield site such as this to at least have an ecological assessment submitted with it. It is disappointing that a local developer ignores these issues.

The applications should simply be refused.

Yours sincerely,



06 09 21
J DRUMMOND
ROSECRAIG
BANKFOOT
PERTHSHIRE
PH1 4EE

[REDACTED]
Development Standards
Angus Council
Orchard Business Park
Forfar
Angus DD8 1AN

31st of August 2021

[REDACTED]
Dear Sir,

21/00557/FULL: Site at Greenlawhill Farm, Greenlaw Terrace, Barry

21/00558/FULL: Field 70m North West of Greenlaw, Greenlaw Terrace, Barry

I wish to register my objection to the above planning applications.

Both proposals lack any 'green' credentials. The hedge to the north of the site provides a barrier when the field crops are being sprayed and it stops any over-spray spreading to houses. It is not sufficient to allow the developer to decide which trees are felled and which are kept. The first application included a tree survey and this should be looked at again and the mature trees should be retained. On the south side of the development there is a steep slope leading down to houses at Corbie Drive. This slope has natural springs and currently the trees help soak up the water, however if they are removed, the Corbie Drive residents will see more water going down into their area, with potential of flooding during heavy rain.

Both of these applications should be refused.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]
J Drummond

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Jerry Swinley

Address: 62 Thomas Street Carnoustie DD77LA

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: More houses isn't the issue IF and it's a big IF IF there is infrastructure to support them.

This is crazy.

Please listen.

SCHOOLS AND MEDICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ARE INADEQUATE AS IT IS.

When are the planning authorities going to listen to the towns existing residents. We want Carnoustie to prosper certainly but not at the expense of rubbish services because they are overwhelmed.

Fix the medical and school provision THEN approve the developments.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mike Hall

Address: Pentland Cottage, Main Street, Barry Carnoustie DD7 7RP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Yet another scheme to build too many houses on a small plot of land. There's simply no requirement for these houses here considering the huge development being built over the road from this site. It would also be further erosion of the separation that Barry has from Carnoustie which keeps Barry as a pleasant and quiet village.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Aimee Venables

Address: 88 macdonald smith drive Carnoustie Dd7 7tb

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Ridiculous that you want to take more green land and build houses. Carnoustie is supposed to be a quaint village not an extension of Arbroath or Carnoustie. Despite what one of the ridiculous councillors says the med centre can't cope with the people that live here already. Stop trying to make Carnoustie a city or improve the services for the people that already live here first. Half the shops are shutting or are expensive spars coops etc. No petrol station etc. Work on these before allowing more houses to be built on the lovely places to walk in Carnoustie

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Danielle Scott

Address: 23 queen street Carnoustie DD77AX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Please make plans for another doctors before more houses, can't even get an appointment for a phone call with the people already living here never mind more. Ridiculous

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Emily Garness

Address: Sparrow Croft, Craigton of Monikie Carnoustie DD5 3QN

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Rather than building more estates, even though the school and health centre are at their limits, money should be spent on improving the town.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Emma Allan

Address: 109 Ravensby Road Carnoustie DD7 7NJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We don't need any more houses or destruction of our green spaces around Carnoustie.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Hannah Ingram

Address: 15 Braefoot Carnoustie DD7 7BG

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Carnoustie does not have a viable infrastructure to support the people who would be going into these homes. For example schools are at their limit and also the health centre to name a few. We should make sure the town is not becoming overcrowded and instead focus on more important things to improve the place.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Miss Laraine Taylor

Address: 90 Craigmill Gardens Carnoustie Dd76hu

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Objection due to the fact that Barry Village will soon be nothing other than a few nice houses of character surrounded and overwhelmed by multiple housing schemes . But trying to stem the flow of applications is almost futile , too much money involved to care about the importance of issues . That area is doomed

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: Murray Agnew

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alistair Todd

Address: San Melito Coach House Carlogie CARNOUSTIE DD7 6LD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This proposed development is at the wrong side of town. Persimmon and DJ Laing already have interests in the Upper Pitskelly site, which is currently under construction, and therefore they will not build this site in competition with themselves and any permission would be ineffective. Furthermore, the application site does not have good footpath connections to Carnoustie nor direct access to a bus route and is therefore not sustainable.

More housing should be allowed at the east side of Carnoustie where there are good connections to all the town's facilities including schools and access to public transport - that would also allow for range and choice of housing in Carnoustie.

Barry itself of course has no amenities.

This application should be refused not least due to lack of connectivity.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: Murray Agnew

Customer Details

Name: Mr Greig Marshall

Address: 16 Knapdale Place Dundee DD4 0SL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to register my objection to the above applications and this letter should therefore be recorded as objections to both applications.

As a Local Development Plan opportunity site which requires comprehensive planning, there should be one application for the entire site with appropriate pre-application consultation with the community. This approach does nothing to help the local community have confidence in the planning system.

By splitting the site into two applications, the applicants have merely sought to prevent full and transparent consultation with the community. The applicants should be instructed to withdraw the applications and submit a comprehensive proposal with an associated public event so we can all better understand the full proposals.

Until that happens, these applications should not be supported.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jim Wallace

Address: Greenlaw Barry Carnoustie

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

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

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have recently been told by the developer that they are having to change the plans for this development 'due to technical difficulties' .

Does this mean that this application is null and void until we see any new plans?

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mark Hutchinson

Address: 1 cottage Mains of Ravensby Barry DD7 7RJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Over provision of new homes. No infrastructure to support this. Doctors surgery is overwhelmed and there is not enough large shops to support so many new homes.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mr Matthew Christie

Address: 4 mains of ardestie Monifieth 07731962764

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Stop building houses. The town is struggling enough with school and nursery spaces. There is no petrol station. No decent shops. Not enough for people to do.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mr R Deer

Address: Greenlawhill Carnoustie

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Miscellaneous

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: There is no need for more housing in Carnoustie especially when the current infrastructure cannot cope. Just greedy builders raking in money buying up all the green space. Soon Carnoustie will meet the dual carriageway just like all the new builds across from Dobbies. This site and 21/00557/full is a haven for wildlife. And should be left as such.

Why are the sneaky builders not putting both applications together. Let's the public see they are trying to hide the fact that it's 57 houses they plan to build and not 28.

I wholly object to both applications.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Barbara Wilkinson

Address: 29 Kinloch Street Carnoustie DD7 7EL

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Please see my comment on Application 21/00557/Full.

I believe the public should have been made aware that there are two linked applications pending. The 'Related Cases' tab on this page and the one for 21/00558/Full show no planning applications.

There seems to be a lengthy delay between submission of comments and their appearance on the website. This may give the impression that there is little public interest and deter people from objecting.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: Murray Agnew

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Carol Todd

Address: San Melito Coach House Carlogie Carnoustie DD7 6LD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: These comments apply to both Applications 21/00557/FULL and 21/00558/FULL

As a Local Development Plan allocation, there should be one application for the entire site with appropriate pre-application consultation with the community.

The proposal is also deficient in the information required to determine a detailed application for planning permission. The previous Reporter was clear that this site is in Barry and not Carnoustie and standard house types, such as shown within the Masterplan, are not appropriate for this setting.

The applications should be refused.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Elaine Donald

Address: 88 Craigmill Gardens Carnoustie Dd76HU

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This should only go ahead if more funding is made available for nurseries/ schools/ medical

Centre to allow for extra capacity .

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Elaine Fleming

Address: 7 West Path Carnoustie DD7 7BX

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Until there is more capacity at the Health Centre to actually get appointments there can be no more new houses in Carnoustie. It is already impossible to get appointments.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Eve Swinley

Address: 62 Thomas Street Carnoustie DD77LA

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:When I can phone Medical Centre and not be 17 in a queue all day or Find green areas to walk play with grandchildren no smelly drains no flooding in Ravenby Road why are is there a need for more housing

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Jayne Nicoll

Address: 26 north burnside street Carnoustie Dd77bh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Too many houses and not enough facilities, schools, gp surgeries, shops, petrol stations, and remember sewage.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs kate hall

Address: pentland cottage main st, barry Carnoustie DD7 7RP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This planning application is quite clearly half a project, inextricably linked with 21/00557/FULL. It should raise serious concerns in the committee that the applicants have had to resort to this (rather clumsy) underhand tactic in an attempt to get their shady development plans sneaked through.

Accordingly, I request that the committee consider applications 21/00557/FULL AND 21/00558/FULL as one entity.

This (or these) development(s) must be rejected.

It creates a serious and significant contravention of the the Strategic Long Term plan for the area in which it is made clear that Barry must retain its clear status as a separate village from Carnoustie. The proposed project neighbours directly with Ravensby Park Gardens and Corbie Drive, which would obliterate the clear demarcation which currently exists between Carnoustie and Barry.

The number of houses proposed is frankly obscene, and would double the size of Barry at a single stroke. Such a material change to the nature of the village by a single development is wholly unacceptable. Furthermore, the size of the planned properties, the layout of the estate and the building density proposed is not at all in keeping with the current make up of Barry, and would constitute a serious material change in the character of Barry as a village.

There is a highly likely and serious risk that car traffic from the new development would use the village of Barry as a 'rat run' when travelling towards Dundee. Speeding is already an issue, so

increasing the volume of traffic (as this development undoubtedly would) would certainly result in accidents.

There is no need for these houses to be built as the quota is already being more than adequately met by the two massive housing developments already in progress at both Shanwell and Carlogie.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Lynn Barr

Address: 5 Malt Loan Carnoustie DD77GW

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Already difficult to get doctor appt, even before Covid. Schools bursting. Lack of green space.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sarah Thomson

Address: 22 primrose street Carnoustie Dd7 7qb

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to yet more houses being built in and in the outskirts of Carnoustie

The town has limited services, the schools are very full and the GP practice is stretched as it is (there is an ongoing UK-wide GP shortage so this isn't likely to improve any time soon)

Building on these green spaces provides no benefit to the town, although it will financially benefit a few stakeholders

At this time when the climate emergency is being widely discussed, it is disappointing that beautiful woodland and green spaces are considered expendable

The needs of current Carnoustie residents should be considered - as the covid pandemic has highlighted, it's essential that safe green space is available for people to use without having to travel. Being outside in nature is known to have a positive impact on mental wellbeing, as well as encouraging better physical health.

Angus council has a duty of care to its residents. By allowing Carnoustie's resources to become further stretched, therefore reducing the overall satisfaction of current residents, and by supporting the destruction of well used green spaces, Angus council are not meeting their duty of care. The financial gains of the few should not outweigh the needs of the many

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: Murray Agnew

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Tracey Ritchie

Address: 19 Alexander Gordon Drive Monifieth Dundee DD5 4HD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to register my objection to the above application.

As a Local Development Plan opportunity site which requires comprehensive planning, there should be one application for the entire site, the other half of the site referred to in application 21/00557/FULL with appropriate pre-application consultation with the community. This approach does nothing to help the local community have confidence in the planning system.

By splitting the site into two applications, the applicants have merely sought to prevent full and transparent consultation with the community. In my opinion the applicants should be instructed to withdraw the applications and submit a comprehensive proposal with an associated public event so we can all better understand the full proposals.

Until that happens, these applications should not be supported.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Victoria scott

Address: 51 Barry Road Carnoustie DD77QQ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Improvements to public services are required before any more houses built in Carnoustie.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Ms Laura Ferguson

Address: 33 Ravensby Park Gardens Carnoustie DD7 7NY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am opposed to houses being built behind my residence. Ruining an area of green space and trees that are home to a wide variety of different species.

Additionally Carnoustie doesn't have the necessary infrastructure to support further houses being built.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Steven Burke

Address: Dunvegan Main St Barry DD77RP

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Local services are already under too much pressure.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Wendy allan

Address: 46 lochend road Carnoustie DD77QF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Carnoustie does not have the facilities for anymore houses

The schools doctors and dentists are nearly at capability

Comments for Planning Application 21/00558/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00558/FULL

Address: Field 70M North West Of Greenlaw Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 28 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Carol Venables

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: This a two part application which is very deceptive by the applicants, Barry does not need this or want it, too many houses are being built in this area, we already have a large estate being but opposite just pure greed from developer

It's a haven for wildlife and too many green fields are being lost in this area

Refuse all applications as it does not fit with local planning .medical centre can't cope with more housing schools will struggle

We don't need this in Barry

Comments for Planning Application 21/00557/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00557/FULL

Address: Site At Greenlawhill Farm Greenlaw Terrace Barry

Proposal: Erection of 29 Dwellinghouses, Formation of Access Roads, Open Space, Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure

Case Officer: James Wright

Customer Details

Name: Mr j bowen

Address: 107 Ravensby Road Carnoustie DD7 7NJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Another development which appears to have lack of off street and on street parking bays within this and also 21/00558/FULL development. Too many houses.

How can these developments only say 6 + 6 children for schools? each house on average could have 2 children! 114 children.