

KILLINGWORTH - 14/03532/PPP - 10 FLATS AT BROWNHILLS GARAGE, ST. ANDREWS

Penny Uprichard [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 November 2014 11:54**To:** Development Central**Cc:** [REDACTED] Cllr.Keith McCartney; [REDACTED] Cllr Dorothea Morrison**Categories:**In Progress

Dear Sir,

14/03532/ PPP – REDEVELOPMENT OF
BROWNHILLS
GARAGE SITE INCLUDING DEMOLITION, AND
ERECTION OF 10 FLATTED DWELLINGS

The STACC Planning Committee wishes to lodge an OBJECTION to this application.

The supporting statement from G & G Properties Ltd. refers to Local Plan (2012) policies, and says in para. 3.2 that Policy E 15 (Development in the Countryside) confirms that:

‘ . . . development will be appropriate where it is for housing complying with Policy E 16 Housing in the Countryside . . . ’.

However, Policy E 16 says ***‘this policy does not apply in land designated as green belt. New housing in the green belt should be considered in the context of Policies E 15 (Countryside) and E 17 (Green Belt).’***

This proposal therefore conflicts with Policy E 15, where there is no support for housing unless it complies with Policy E 16, and E 16 is not relevant in Green Belt.

With regard to Policy E 17 on Green Belt, the supporting statement says that:

‘ . . . the proposed redevelopment of the Brownhills Garage site represents an opportunity to considerably enhance the environmental quality of the immediate area and also to improve the setting of St. Andrews and views from the town itself.’

Policy E 17 says that development must *‘result in an overall enhancement to the landscape and environmental quality of the green belt’*. It is difficult to believe that a two-storey building, on an extremely prominent site high above the town, would fulfil this

requirement. There is nothing in the policy to support residential development of this kind in Green Belt. The claim that the proposal would *'improve the setting of St. Andrews'* is fanciful.

The building would not be consistent with its rural location nor with the nearby cottages. Its location, while in theory within walking distance of the town, will mean residents walking down a very busy road with a double roundabout at the bottom; there is no safe route for pedestrians across this junction.

There is also a requirement in E 17 for *'... new development of exemplary design'*. As this is a PPP application, no design details are available. They should be available before planning permission of any kind is considered.

Para . 3.8 refers to *'a short term need for additional housing development within the immediate St. Andrews area'*. Housing need is not a material consideration in planning applications, nor is this site proposed for development in the Local Plan 2012. It is therefore contrary to the development plan.

Transportation – it is noted that the response from this department includes the following:

'Note to Planner:

The indicative layout is not suitable as it does not seem to allow for suitable turning and manoeuvring, particularly with regard to larger vehicles, IE Bin Lorries due to the constraints of the site and the parking layout.'

The developers refer to *'small scale development which will not prejudice the strategy for long term development of St. Andrews'*. Unlike Cupar, where small scale development appears to have been ruled out in order to protect the Cupar North development, in St. Andrews the proposed 'western extension' of a minimum of 1,000 houses has not prevented hundreds of other housing units being given approval. 'Viability' is not a planning consideration, but common sense would require assessment of whether the proposed flats would sell, given the options available within the town boundary.

In the two years since the Local Plan was adopted, substantial developments in Green Belt and Countryside have been recommended for approval by officials and approved (Feddinch, Brownhills, Wonder Years Nursery). It is hoped that Councillors will seriously consider the impact on St. Andrews of the numerous occasions where the policies

are being overridden in favour of commercial benefit for those profiting from these applications. St. Andrews is still *'the most important small historic burgh in Scotland'*, and is on the verge of being destroyed by development and the resultant traffic problems in and around the town.

The objection from Mr. Jollie appears to cast doubt on the accuracy of the site plan and the traffic assessment. Have these matters been clarified?

This proposal will only detract from the town and its landscape setting, and should be refused.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Yours faithfully,
P. M. Uprichard
For the STACC Planning Committee