

While the application may fall within the definition of not being "contrary in terms of the development plan" point 1.4 below goes on to outline how this Development Plan is already subject to MIR review and was out for public consultation and this fact alone should have been recognised and accounted for when considering this request. By not acknowledging and logging the 60 plus individual objections, including those of two community councils and elected representatives, this statement hides the real truth that there was substantial body of formal objection to this large development from the local community at Gilbertfield

and the surrounding areas. The fact that South Lanarkshire Council has only allowed 1 presentation to the Planning Committee in each of the past 5 years points to a severe failure of the Planning Committee Terms of Reference to facilitate community engagement, contravenes the new legislation on the role of Community Councils and is contrary to SLAN Connect Council Plan 2012-2017

1.3. Token Gesture of Consultation - Meeting with local resident Stephen Towill and Councillor Walter Brogan

Planning officers met a local resident Stephen Towill and our local councillor Walter Brogan a week before the Planning Committee meeting with glazed eyes smiling, nodding heads and acknowledging all of the issues raised both with the actual site at Gilbertfield and in relation to Cambuslang East and the lack of supporting infrastructure to sustain the huge population. But all they got back was a clear steer that the recommendation to approve the application is going forward to Planning Committee and the Local Development Plan says it will be residential so it must be residential. Nothing substantial came out of that meeting or was raised at the committee other than agreement that the local Councillor could have a 5 minute representation. This was not satisfactory to the people of Cambuslang East.

1.4 Local Development Plan and Lack of Supporting Community Infrastructure

We have recently commented on the Local Development Plan which took ages to be adopted (June 2015) is now subject to a "too early" MIR review (when the Strategic Clydeplan has not yet even been considered). Surely this fact alone should be taken into account when considering planning applications and making recommendations at this time? It's not black and white and it feels like the Planning Department officers operate to a higher law (local development plan) rather than considering the bigger picture, applying common sense and reasonableness to recommendations made and most importantly listening to and involving us in what our community needs. The Planning dept re-zoned the area of land at Gilbertfield to residential 10 years ago without any local consultation with the local community council. It should not be automatic that because the planning application is NOT contrary to the local development plan that it should just be rubber stamped and approved at the expense of even considering some formal objections. There are key issues on DESIGN, DENSITY, SENSE OF PLACE, and IMPACT ON INFRASTRUCTURE that should still have been considered but which were all skated over.

A lot can happen in 10 years and has in Cambuslang East. There has been a huge increase in population and the people of Cambuslang East do not want any more housing for the one main reason; the area has not received anywhere near the required supporting infrastructure to sustain a population of its current size, never mind a growing one. When is your council going to actually realise that they cannot continue to pile in houses, making Cambuslang

East a concrete jungle, without planning for and ensuring there are adequate resources, facilities and amenities to support increasing communities?

1.5 Lack of communication, community consideration and local partnership approach to major planning developments

South Lanarkshire Planning department knew that over 4000 objections were raised against a previous planning attempt to build houses on this same site a number of years ago yet

never made any efforts at all to recognise the local feeling against such a development plan in this location and advise and support accordingly when a new application (using out of date environmental reports from 2003 and 2005) was submitted by Persimmon.

The developer never held any public meetings in or near the site over their proposed application and the whole application was considered very covertly. There was one meeting poorly publicised, at a far enough away distance not to be known or accessible to the local people at Gilbertfield. Other than the original notice going into the local paper two years ago Halfway Community Council never received any recent communications that this planning application was going ahead. After a period of two years it was a reasonable assumption to make that this planning application was not going forward. There was indeed no documentation of any meetings or of discussions with the developer or bodies such as SEPA publicised on-line to suggest the application was actually progressing. For example - the information that led to SEPA withdrawing its formal objection is still not available - with South Lanarkshire Council planning dept saying it never even received the report cited in the SEPA letter. All very covertly dealt with.

Our community council and our neighbouring community council and our local community councillors, local councillors, MP, MSP's and the wider Cambuslang community in Cambuslang have tirelessly raised concerns to your council in relation to significant increases in population with little strategic planning and consideration given to the supporting infrastructure that is needed for a community of our size. Halfway Community Council and its members have never been empowered by any means in relation to considering any significant planning applications and their impact on the real lives of its residents.

No discussions have taken place in relation to application **(CR/15/0239)** and how any community gain monies could be spent to best serve the community and no documentation has been posted on-line to indicate how the development will actually contribute to the required infrastructure."

As recent as last year the community gain money received c.£200k from the housing development in Newton, Cambuslang went out of our town completely to the neighbouring town in Uddingston with **no consultation or involvement** with Halfway Community Council, which represents all of Cambuslang East. We have a letter from you dated 15 February 2017 in which you quote a circular and "policy 5 statement that financial contributions must:

- Serve a planning purpose
- Be necessary to the proposed development
- Be **directly related** to the proposed development
- Be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposal and

Be reasonable in all other aspect “

We have a wealth of local knowledge and want positive community progress but have never been given the opportunity or empowerment to advise how community gain money can be best spent within Cambuslang East. When is SLC going to wake up and apply the Scottish government guidance and legislation on community empowerment?

Section 2 - Grounds for Complaint Planning Application - Procedural Flaws

Following review of the planning decision made on the 28th of March 2017 and after seeking professional advice there are a number of procedural flaws and evident bias by the Planning departments handling of the planning application - to an extent and degree that would appear to have severely fettered their discretion, and which undermine the professional and transparent approach that planning departments are encouraged to take by the Scottish Government.

While we understand that the process for appealing against procedural flaws is directly to the Scottish Government we feel it is important you are aware of the grounds for our complaint at a local council level and have the opportunity to respond and put right any errors by having the planning application reconsidered with accurate and full information.

The planning report as it stands appears to have been rushed (possibly to be considered before the local councillor elections?) as it is an assembly of an incoherent jumble of specialist reports and assessments with no apparent independent, coherent, objective, or overall assessment – or overall Remediation Strategy.

2.1. Fails to directly deliver any Affordable Housing (in breach of the Council's own LDP Planning Policies 13 in SLAN LDP and SG.7).

There is complete confusion about the actual number of houses to be constructed by the application (and actual site area). The actual application form submitted on 11 Dec 2015 and certified by agent Kevin Crawford (as posted on Council web site) and **was actually for 237 dwellings on a stated site area of 17.26ha**. This was broadly in line with the 215 houses mentioned in the pre-application consultation (CR/15/X0029/NEW). There are no further submission documents or revised plans tabled on-line. The application was for full Planning approval – not in outline. It is therefore unclear by what authority the Council has continually changed the housing numbers and site area (none are at present available) – but it simply is not in compliance with the actual planning Application form.

With no apparent documentation or revised plans being tabled on-line, during the bulk of the planning consideration period from 11 Dec 2015 to early 2017, the planning consultation appears to have considered a proposal for 437 housing units (including affordable housing) – presumably being the “422 detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses and 15 flats” also mentioned. However the Design & Access Statement (Nov 2015) says that it relates to a scheme of 418 housing units – but at section 4 has a schedule for 437 housing units for the whole site (but again fails to identify or mention any affordable housing). However following the 2nd response from SEPA in 11 Nov 2016 – and before the writing up of the report - the South Lanarkshire Planning officers appear to have magically “reduced”