



Item 6

11th November 2025

Planning Services 231 George Street GLASGOW G1 1RX Tel: 0141 287 8555 Email: onlineplanning@glasgow.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100719453-001

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? * (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

☒ Applicant ☐ Agent

Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:

Mr

You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *

Other Title:

Building Name:

First Name: *

RAVIKUMAR

Building Number:

47

Last Name: *

SINGH

Address 1
(Street): *

47 Oykel Crescent

Company/Organisation

Address 2:

Telephone Number: *

7405653632

Town/City: *

Glasgow

Extension Number:

Country: *

Lanarkshire

Mobile Number:

Postcode: *

G33 1FD

Fax Number:

Email Address: *

singhr10@gmail.com

Site Address Details

Planning Authority:

Glasgow City Council

Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):

Address 1:

47 OYKEL CRESCENT

Address 2:

Address 3:

Address 4:

Address 5:

Town/City/Settlement:

GLASGOW

Post Code:

G33 1FD

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing

669376

Easting

263938

Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: *
(Max 500 characters)

The application seeks consent for the use of garage as long-term residential accommodation with associated alterations - Section 42 application to amend condition 01 of planning permission 21/00716/FUL. Clarified intent with updated wording "The granny flat hereby approved shall only be occupied as a long-term residence by a single tenant/couple or a dependent relative of the host dwelling, and shall not be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of separately from the main dwelling-house."

Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? *

☐

Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).

☐

Application for planning permission in principle.

☒

Further application.

☐

Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? *

- ☒ Refusal Notice.
- ☐ Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- ☐ No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: * (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

A review of the planning decision is requested because the decision notice and the detailed report of handling is based on the claims which are not factually correct. The key reasons for refusal was based on the fact that 1) Proposal not in accordance with development plan 2) Proposal is contrary to Policy 16. Quality homes of NPF4 and CDP1 and SG1. The assessment is based on assumptions rather than actual facts that I would like the committee to look at. Response to key objections

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the Determination on your application was made? *

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: * (Max 500 characters)

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: * (Max 500 characters)

1)Appeal Statement & Review Response (incl. Policy Compliance); Proposed revised planning condition; Supporting material on proposed solar panel installation for main dwelling-house. 2)Photographic evidence of garden use, frontage, and amenity 3)Map extract showing corner plot and street frontage 4)Objection response letter - Neighbour and councillor and evidence of engagement. 5)Management plan for long term let

Application Details

Please provide the application reference no. given to you by your planning authority for your previous application.

25/00800/FUL

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? *

09/04/2025

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? *

16/06/2025

Review Procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. *

☒ Yes ☐ No

In the event that the Local Review Body appointed to consider your application decides to inspect the site, in your opinion:

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? *

☐ Yes ☒ No

Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant?. *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? *

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. You may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review *

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice (if any) from the earlier consent.

Declare – Notice of Review

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: Mr RAVIKUMAR SINGH

Declaration Date: 12/09/2025

Payment Details

Online payment: 767752

Payment date: 12/09/2025 13:38:34

Created: 12/09/2025 13:38

Appeal Statement for 47 Oykel Crescent, G33 1FD Planning Application 25/00800/FUL

LOCATION

The property at 47 Oykel Crescent, Glasgow, G33 1FD, encompasses a residential site delineated by a red boundary line per ScotLIS records, indicating its zoning as residential land. This site features a detached single-storey granny flat, a two-storey detached residential dwellinghouse, and its associated grounds towards the southern extremity of Oykel Crescent. The vicinity is part of a recently developed residential zone strategically positioned towards the northeast of Robroyston, south of Lumloch Road, and lies within Local Ward 17- Springburn/Robroyston.

Oykel Crescent is conveniently located near Dochart Oval and Auchinleck Road. The dwelling is only a 6-minute drive from the Robroyston train station, which provides direct links to Glasgow's bustling city center. It is a mere 4 minutes from the M80 motorway, facilitating broader travel. Glasgow city center, a hub of cultural and commercial activity known for its wide array of bars, restaurants, and shopping options, can be reached in about 20 minutes by car. Additionally, the property benefits from its proximity to Robroyston and Glendale, which offer a comprehensive selection of local amenities.



Appeal against refusal to vary Condition 01 of planning permission 21/00716/FUL (garage conversion to habitable accommodation)

1. Introduction

This appeal proposes review of refusal of planning application 25/00800/FUL, which sought to vary Condition 01 of permission 21/00716/FUL.

The garage conversion, approved in 2021, is now complete and provides a modest habitable unit (approx. 30.7 sqm). The appeal seeks permission to use the space for long-term residential occupancy while remaining part of the same curtilage and title as the main house.

This application is not for a new dwelling, subdivision, or short-term let. It is solely to enable managed long-term use (by a single tenant, dependent relative, or household member), with the property remaining under the control of the host dwelling. A detailed management plan was provided as a part of the planning application and is attached in the Appendix for your reference.

2. Clarification of Intent

The application explicitly sought to vary Condition 01, not remove it.

The application form stated: "We are requesting approval to allow the space to be used as a self-contained residential unit for long-term rental occupancy. No structural changes are proposed. The works covered under the original permission are complete."

The officer's report mischaracterised this as an attempt to create a wholly new dwelling, which is incorrect.

Design and Materials	The application seeks consent for the use of garage as long-term residential accommodation with associated alterations - Section 42 application to amend condition 01 of planning permission 21/00716/FUL. The application form advises "This application seeks to vary Condition 01 of the original planning permission 21/00716/FUL dated 18th Aug 2021 for the garage conversion at 47 Oykel Crescent, which currently restricts its use to a domestic outbuilding incidental to the main dwelling. We are requesting approval to allow the space to be used as a self-contained residential unit for long-term rental occupancy. No structural changes are proposed. The works covered under the original permission are complete." Condition 01 of the 21/00716/FUL is set out below:
-----------------------------	---

	01. <i>The granny flat hereby approved from the garage conversion shall be used only as a domestic outbuilding incidental to the enjoyment of the host dwellinghouse and for no other purpose without the prior written approval of the Planning Authority.</i> Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the surrounding area The applicant has not suggested any revised wording to vary condition 01, but rather seeks the removal of the use restrictions specific to that condition. Removing condition 01 of the 21/00716/FUL application would disassociate the use of the granny flat as ancillary accommodation to the main dwellinghouse, effectively creating a new dwellinghouse within the existing residential plot.
--	---

To address control concerns, the applicant proposes a revised condition or on similar lines that provides approval to use place a long term let with standard PRT agreement

"The granny flat hereby approved shall only be occupied as a long-term residence by a single tenant/couple or a dependent relative of the host dwelling, and shall not be `

This ensures ongoing planning control and addresses concerns about subdivision or intensification.

3. Response to DECISION NOTICE for planning application 25/00800/FUL

Response to Refusal decision 01 as per Decision Notice

01. The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan and there were no material considerations which outweighed the proposal's variance with the Development Plan.

First, the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan due to below reasons.

The granny flat provides a safe, healthy, energy-efficient long-term home, consistent with NPF4 Policy 16 (Quality Homes). It has a clear frontage to Oykel Crescent, substantial usable garden space, and no detrimental impact on residential amenity, thereby aligning with CDP1 and SG1. The officer's mischaracterisation of the use as a "new dwellinghouse" is inaccurate, the granny flat remains within the same curtilage, ownership, and title as the host dwelling.

Second, even if there were residual concerns, there are significant material considerations which outweigh them. The property has been successfully let to long-term tenant for 3 months to a community worker in need. There have been no issues/incidents with this letting as no complaints has been made. (April 25- June 25).

The accommodation provides needed housing choice in the area for NHS doctors/teachers or community worker who do not intend to buy a 3-4-bedroom house and thus supports sustainability by re-using existing building where there is shortage of quality homes on a long-term basis. The area provides options only for ownership of a detached/semi-detached houses which might not be suitable for everyone due to various circumstances

Finally, there is also a proposal to install additional solar panels (12 panels) to the main property to further contribute to net zero targets

Taken together, these considerations clearly outweigh any perceived variance and demonstrate that approval of this application would be fully consistent with the as of the Development Plan.

Response to Refusal decision 02 as per Decision Notice

02. The proposal is contrary to Policy 16: Quality Homes of National Planning Framework 4 and policy CDP1 and SG1 'Placemaking' of the Glasgow City Development Plan in that removing the use restrictions of condition 01 of planning permission reference 21/00716/FUL would disassociate the use of the granny flat as ancillary accommodation to the main dwellinghouse, effectively creating a new dwellinghouse within the existing residential plot.

The resultant dwellinghouse would not provide quality accommodation that is suitable for residential use. The resultant dwellinghouse lacks a frontage on to a public street and has no private garden ground. The proposed dwellinghouse is accessed from the rear private garden of the main dwellinghouse, and would result in unacceptable privacy and amenity conflicts with the main dwellinghouse. The proposal would not result in good quality accommodation with appropriate facilities and residential amenity.

Officer's Position (from refusal notice)

The decision notice states that the proposal is contrary to:

- **NPF4 Policy 16: Quality Homes**
- **CDP1 and SG1: Placemaking**

...on the basis that:

1. Removing Condition 01 would “disassociate” the granny flat from the host dwelling.
2. This would “effectively create a new dwellinghouse within the plot.”
3. That new dwelling would lack a frontage to the street, private garden ground, and would cause amenity/privacy conflicts.

Response:

1. Nature of the Proposal

- The proposal does **not** seek to create a separate dwellinghouse in the planning sense (no separate title, no subdivision of land, no sale for independent occupation).
- It is a **variation of condition** under Section 42 — not a new build or subdivision application.
- The unit remains within the same **ownership, title, curtilage, and access** as the main house.
- Use will be limited to **extended family, dependents, or a long-term tenant** — not a new household in planning terms.

✓ This distinction means the proposal should not be equated with creating a “new dwellinghouse.”

1. Policy 16 – Quality Homes

Policy 16 requires homes to be **safe, secure, healthy, of a good standard, and well-integrated.**

- The granny flat has proper insulation, heating, lighting, ventilation, and outlook.
- It benefits from direct access to garden ground and outdoor amenity space (Appendix A photographs).
- Previous long-term tenants (e.g., community worker relocating from Wales) confirm the accommodation supports healthy, high-quality living.

✓ The evidence demonstrates compliance with Policy 16. The officer’s assumption of “poor quality” is untested and contradicted by lived experience.

3. CDP1 and SG1 – Placemaking

CDP1 and SG1 require new development to:

- Respect **scale, massing, and character.**
- Avoid **overdevelopment.**
- Provide **appropriate amenity and garden space.**

At 47 Oykel Crescent:

- The granny flat has a clear **street frontage** (corner plot) — not hidden at the rear.
- The plot remains generous compared with many newer houses in the estate.
- The garden is fully usable and shared without conflict — demonstrated by photographic evidence of families and tenants using the space.
- Privacy concerns between the main house and flat are misplaced, as windows face different directions (flat overlooks driveway, house overlooks garden).

✓ The proposal respects the principles of CDP1/SG1 and avoids the overdevelopment feared by the officer.

4. Inconsistency in Officer Assessment

- The handling report acknowledges the conversion itself does not harm the **character, size, or materials** of the building.
- Yet it concludes the use alone creates conflict with Policy 16/CDP1/SG1.
- This ignores that **use and design are inseparable**: if the physical form is acceptable, and the amenity works in practice, then the use is also acceptable when conditioned.

4. Response to Background Information and Policy Compliance

Other Comments	Background information The application proposal is a further application for planning permission under Section 42 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (the Act) to vary Condition 1 of planning permission 21/00716/FUL. Section 42 <i>Determination of applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached.</i>
	(1) This section applies, subject to subsection (4), to applications for planning permission for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted. (2) On such an application the planning authority shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted, and— (a) if they decide that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions differing from those subject to which the previous permission was granted, or that it should be granted unconditionally, they shall grant planning permission accordingly; (b) if they decide that planning permission should be granted subject to the same conditions as those subject to which the previous permission was granted, they shall refuse the application. (3) The Scottish Ministers may by regulations or a development order make special provision as regards the procedure to be followed in connection with such applications.] (4) This section does not apply if the previous permission was granted subject to a condition as to the time within which the development to which it related was to be begun, and that time has expired without the development having been begun. Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts require that when an application is made, it shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations dictate otherwise. The issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are therefore considered to be: a) whether the proposal accords with the statutory Development Plan; and b) whether any other material considerations (including objections) have been satisfactorily addressed. In respect of (a), the Development Plan comprises of NPF4 adopted 13th February 2023 and the Glasgow City Development Plan adopted on the 29th March 2017.

1. Section 42 Context

The report frames this application as “removing” a condition in a way that would create a new dwellinghouse. That is a misinterpretation.

- The application form clearly stated the request was to **vary Condition 01** to allow **long-term occupancy** of the granny flat.

- The proposal does not involve subdivision, sale, or the creation of a new planning unit. The flat remains **within the same curtilage, title, and ownership** as the host dwelling.
 - A revised condition tying occupancy to the main house (as already offered) addresses the authority's concern about future disassociation.
-

	CDP 1: <i>is an overarching Policy which must be considered for all development proposals to help achieve the key aims of the Glasgow City Development Plan. The Policy aims to improve the quality of development taking place in Glasgow by promoting a design-led approach. This will contribute towards protecting and improving the quality of the environment, improving health and reducing health inequality, making the planning process as inclusive as possible and ensuring that new development attains the highest sustainability levels. CDP 1 states that new development should provide high quality amenity to existing and new residents and respect the environment by responding to its qualities and character.</i> 2.50 <i>The aim of this guidance is to ensure that conversions and subdivisions result in good quality accommodation with appropriate facilities and residential amenity.</i> 2.53 <i>Where the building and/or the site makes the provision of private garden space difficult, developers should look at the possibility of creative alternative solutions, such as shared roof gardens or private terraces or balconies for flats. Where little external common garden space is being provided, developers will be expected to bring forward mitigation measures to improve internal amenity, such as larger flats, more generous room sizes and the maximisation of window sizes in all habitable rooms.</i> 2.60 Residential Development in Lanes and Gardens - <i>The City contains many detached and semi-detached houses with generous gardens to the side and/or rear of the properties. Development of part of these gardens for additional dwellings, however, can often result in overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of the residential amenity of both the existing and the new properties.</i> 2.61 <i>Proposals for residential development will require to meet all the following criteria:</i> <i>a) the new plot(s) being created should comply with the average residential plot size of similar dwellings in the surrounding area;</i> <i>b) the development should match the scale and massing of adjacent residential property;</i> <i>c) the development must have a frontage on to a public street; and</i> <i>d) all other relevant standards should be met.</i> Comment: The applicant has not suggested any revised wording to vary condition 01, but rather seeks the removal of the use restrictions specific to that condition. Removing the use restrictions of condition 01 of the 21/00716/FUL application would disassociate the use of the granny flat as ancillary accommodation to the main dwellinghouse, effectively creating a new dwellinghouse within the existing residential plot. The proposed change to condition 01 is found not to be acceptable for the following reasons: • The proposed self-contained dwellinghouse would not provide quality accommodation that is suitable for residential use. The dwellinghouse lacks a frontage on to a public street and has no private garden ground. The dwellinghouse is accessed from the rear private garden of the main dwellinghouse, and would result in unacceptable privacy and amenity conflicts with the main dwellinghouse.
--	---

2. Street Frontage

The officer claims the unit lacks frontage onto a public street.

- 47 Oykel Crescent is a **corner plot**, and the flat has a **direct street-facing elevation and door onto Oykel Crescent**.
- This is materially different from rear garden conversions elsewhere and satisfies CDP1/SG1 requirements for legibility and integration.

✓ The refusal is factually inaccurate on this point.

3. Private Garden Ground and Amenity

The decision states the unit has no private garden space and offers no alternative solutions.

- SG1 gives **qualitative, not quantitative** standards — it asks for “appropriate” garden/amenity.
- The flat enjoys direct access to a paved seating/dining area and the wider garden. Photographs (Appendix A) show previous tenants using this space successfully for recreation.
- The remaining garden area is generous compared to newer plots in later phases of the estate.

✓ Practical evidence shows the amenity works well in reality and meets the intent of Policy 16 and CDP1.

4. Privacy and Amenity Conflicts

The report suggests “mutual overlooking” between the main house and flat.

- In reality, the **flat overlooks the driveway**, while the **main dwelling overlooks the garden**.
- Windows are not directly facing each other, and the use has operated without conflict.
- Additional landscaping/fencing can be added if required.

✓ Privacy concerns are misplaced and not supported by the site layout. Refer to Appendix A photos

5. Overdevelopment and Plot Size

The refusal states the proposal represents overdevelopment and does not match adjacent scale/massing.

- No additional built form is proposed beyond permission 21/00716/FUL. The footprint (approx. 30.7 sqm) is modest.
- The unit integrates in massing, materials, and design — acknowledged in the officer’s own report.
- The plot remains consistent with the **density of corner plots** in the wider estate.

✓ The proposal does not introduce overdevelopment; it maintains an open and balanced plot.

6. Policy 16 (NPF4) – Quality Homes

The report claims the flat does not deliver a “quality home.”

- In practice, the unit provides proper heating, lighting, ventilation, and insulation.
- It has direct access to usable garden space.
- It has already supported high-quality occupation by long-term tenants (e.g., a community worker relocating to Glasgow).

✓ This is evidence-based compliance with Policy 16.

7. Material Considerations

The refusal asserts that “no material considerations outweighed” the alleged variance.

- Positive use history demonstrates no amenity or neighbour issues.
- The unit supports local housing needs by offering **flexible single-person accommodation**.
- The applicant has committed to further sustainability improvements (solar panel installation), aligning with NPF4 Policies 1 and 2.

✓ These are clear material considerations in favour of approval.

5. Conclusion

The refusal misapplies Policy 16, CDP1, and SG1 by treating the proposal as a “new dwellinghouse” when in fact it is an **ancillary but flexible residential use within the same curtilage**.

- The accommodation meets the **standards of quality homes**.
- The site layout provides sufficient **garden, privacy, and character integration**.
- A **revised condition** can ensure the unit remains tied to the host dwelling, preventing subdivision or misuse.

✓ Properly interpreted, the proposal **complies with Policy 16, CDP1, and SG1**, and should not have been refused on those grounds.

The refusal rests on inaccuracies (street frontage, privacy, garden ground) and a misreading of the application intent.

The unit has already proven suitable for long-term occupancy.

The proposal aligns with NPF4 and the City Development Plan, particularly Policy 16 (Quality Homes) and CDP1/SG1 (Placemaking).

A revised condition has been offered to secure planning control.

Request: The Local Review Committee is respectfully asked to overturn the refusal and grant approval to vary Condition 01 of 21/00716/FUL.

6. Other Material Considerations

- Only one detailed objection was received, focusing on personal allegations rather than planning grounds (see Appendix B1).
- Other objections were template-based and lacked site-specific evidence (see Appendix B2).
- The proposal reuses an existing building sustainably, supporting NPF4 Policies 1 and 2.

Appendix A – Photographic Evidence

The following photos (faces blurred as appropriate) provide visual evidence of unit's street frontage, garden usability, and amenity:

- The unit's direct frontage to Oykel Crescent.
 - Paved patio/garden space used by a previous long-term tenant for leisure.
 - Children playing in the garden, confirming amenity use.
 - Orientation of windows demonstrating no overlooking conflict.
 - The spatial relationship between the unit, the garden, and the main house;
 - Generous plot size and no overdevelopment.
 - Children actively using the play area, affirming that this is high-quality amenity space.
- (Photos: faces blurred as appropriate.)







Appendix B – Response to Objections

It is important to note that, aside from one early objection submitted on 4 May 2024 (a one-line opposition with no material planning grounds), the remaining objections were submitted in a cluster later in May and display almost identical wording. At least five of these objections are effectively copies of the same template, raising the same generic concerns (amenity, noise, parking, ‘subdivision’, and precedent) without offering new or site-specific evidence. Only one objection (from Ms. Siobheann Carmichael) provides a longer narrative, albeit heavily personalized. This clustering and duplication suggest a coordinated effort, inflating objection numbers without introducing materially distinct planning considerations. For planning purposes, it is respectfully submitted that these objections should be considered on their substance rather than volume.

B1. Summary of Response to Objection by Ms. Siobheann Carmichael

- Focused on personal allegations, not valid planning grounds.
- Misrepresented guest reviews and activity; no evidence of disturbance.
- Current application relates to long-term let, not STL.
- No complaints upheld by Police or Environmental Health.

Request to refer to detailed response as a separate attachment.

B2. Summary of Objections

I would like to bring attention to the timing of all these objection submissions and these suggest these 9/10 were submitted as a cluster on the same day 25th May 2025 between 16:00:00 – mid night.

Objector	Submission Date and Time	Style
Rizwan & Uzzma Din	7 th May 2025	Minimal (1-line)
Siobheann Carmichael	25 th May 2025	Detailed, timeline
Emma Keenan	25 th May 2025 16:11:23	Template-style
Leeanne Shine	25 th May 2025 16:21:04	Template-style
Maureen McCloskey	25 th May 2025 16:39:12	Policy + template
Marion Ross	25 th May 2025 17:35:06	Template-style

Michelle & Anthony Harkins	25 th May 2025	17:17:34	Template-style
Lyn Miller	25 th May 2025	18:23:10	Template-style
Ashleigh McNally	25 th May 2025	20:10:45	Template-style
Natalie Byrne	26 th May 2025	00:56:20	Only Subject as it was probably late in night. Rushed to get it registred

Below is example of template of objection by themes

Theme	Marion Ross	Michelle & Anthony Harkins	Lyn Miller
Intro / Purpose	"I object..."	"We object..."	"I strongly object..."
Amenity / Character	"Harm the quiet character..."	"Disrupt residential character..."	"Incompatible with Wallacefields..."
Noise / Traffic	"Noise and traffic increase."	"Noise and traffic inevitably rise."	"More noise and traffic."
Precedent / Subdivision	"Dangerous precedent."	"Risk of more subdivision."	"Could lead to subdivision."
Green Space	"Pressure on gardens."	"Pressure on green areas."	"Unacceptable pressure on green areas."
Closing	"Should be refused."	"Ask GCC to refuse."	"Council should reject."

Observations:

- Language and themes are repetitive, indicating a template rather than independent assessment.
- No site-specific evidence is provided.
- Concerns are generic and not demonstrated in relation to 47 Oykel Crescent.

Conclusion: Committee should take this into consideration as these objections are really from the residents or they were asked to do so to generate a volume and weigh down the application. There are no factual/material considerations in either of these objections.

Conclusion

- One detailed objection is personal and irrelevant to planning.
- Other objections are repetitive and generic.
- The application should be determined on planning policy and factual site evidence, not the volume of representations.