

Submitting your views on the Proposal

Rules and Guidelines

1. Submissions may be in the following forms, ranked in the order of importance that the planning committee is likely to use:
 - a. A letter/e-mail written personally by you. Additional words/pictures from your child, explaining what the loss of the Meadow would mean to them, is **very** powerful!
 - b. A form letter/email with your signature and details added
 - c. A petition entry
2. You may only make **one** submission per household
 - If you make more, they will take the last one only. A quick one now, followed by a longer one, is better than no submission
3. Your letter / email must contain:
 - a. The proposal application number: 12/00924/DC
 - b. Your name
 - c. Your address
4. Your letter / email should be addressed to:
 - Ian Briggs, Development & Regeneration Services, Glasgow City Council, 231 George Square, Glasgow G1 1RX
 - planning.representations@drs.glasgow.gov.uk

Your options

You can

1. Write a personal letter, here, now. We will arrange delivery

or

2. **Both**

Sign a copy of our form letter, now. We will arrange delivery

and

Take away a copy of the notes/guidance sheet and submit a personal letter or email later

To help you, we have created...

- Blank template letters with address, application number etc.
- Bullet points summarising the main issues with the application, with questions inviting you to bring your own experience of the area to these issues. We encourage you to make use of these, personalising them as appropriate, when you write your letter/email.
- Form letter that simply requires the addition of your signature & details.

Primary issues for you to personalise

The purpose of these points is to give you ideas to write about. Feel free to use these words as they are, or rewrite them – *but crucially, extend them with your own experience*. All of our individual experiences, supporting the general argument, will greatly strengthen our overall submissions.

The points A, B and C below follow a logical structure leading to the strongest argument against the proposal. Points D, E, F and G are of slightly lesser importance, but your personal input on these will still be valuable. Summary: concentrate on ABC; if you have time, add as many of DEFGH as you can.

Sections in italics are invitations for you to add your own experience and so personalise your submission.

A. North Kelvin Meadow / The Children's Wood (NKM/CW) – open space at the heart of the local community

NKM/CW has always existed for the benefit of the local community, either as a sports/recreation area, or as green space. It has never been built on. It acts as a vibrant “living lung” for the neighbourhood, where folk meet, play, learn, exercise and grow food. Tenement-living children have described it as their “back garden”. Over 1000 folk use NKM/CW for organised events per month, not counting informal recreational use.

Give your experience of this community resource:

- *Have you met folk on/through NKM/CW?*
- *Do you feel more or less part of the local community because of it?*
- *What have you gained from involvement with NKM/CW?*

B. The Benefits of NKM/CW to children

The Children's Wood is implementing the Council's strategy for outdoor learning, through outdoor playgroup, forest schools clubs and regular events. The Scottish Pre-school Play Association endorses the vital contribution made by the Children's Wood.

How have your children gained from the CW? What benefits do you see for them?

C. Planning proposal makes inadequate compensation for loss of green space

As would be expected from NKM/CW's history, as outlined in (A.) above, the area has an "ENV1 – protected open space" designation in Glasgow City Council's City Plan 2 (CP2). CP2 requires that like-for-like compensation must be given when protected open space is built on. The Council argues that funds from the land sale will be used to upgrade the Queen Margaret Drive football pitches – and that this is like-for-like. It is not. For years, NKM/CW has been of value to the local community as a green space, not as football pitches, used in a wide variety of different ways.

Please identify here how you and your family use the Meadow. Identify aspects that cannot be easily recreated in any nearby local space.

Points A, B, and C combine to highlight a major failing of the proposal:

NKM/CW is in a conservation area. Such a designation requires the character of the area to be maintained. Points A and B describe how NKM/CW contribute significantly to the character of the area. The loss of NKM/CW, with no adequate local like-for-like compensation, will inevitably cause serious damage to the character of the area. Unless this can be addressed, the proposal must be dismissed on the basis of the Council's own policy in City Plan 2.

D. Parking and Traffic issues

The proposal will add to local parking and traffic issues, yet no consultations have been made by the developers.

The proposal assumes space is available on Clouston and Sanda Streets for parking. *From your experience, is this the case?*

Traffic from the main site will **all** flow down Kelbourne St to Queen Margaret Drive – joining the already-increased flow from the new Queen Margaret Drive and Oban Drive developments. *As drivers in the area, do you think this is workable? Discuss your experience.*

E. Sewerage and Rain Water Run-off

The developers have not consulted Scottish Water or SEPA on these issues. It is well-known in the community that the Sanda St / Kelbourne St junction floods regularly, yet all rain-water run-off is targeting to Kelbourne St drains. Additionally, the Kelvin Walkway floods with raw sewage in heavy rainfall, and this comes from the already-overloaded sewer system around the proposed development. Sewage from the new development is to be passed directly into the existing sewer system.

Can you personalise this with your own experience of flooding in either of these areas?

F. Local services overloaded

The developers have made no consultation on the effect of 90 new flats on local services, which are already at capacity. *Describe your experience of the current nursery school, GP surgery and public transport provision, if relevant to you, and how this is likely to be influenced by this, the Queen Margaret Drive and the Oban Drive developments.*

G. Public open space within proposal not improved in line with pre-planning feedback

The developers claim that public open space is provided in the design. During the pre-planning consultation process, the local community raised significant concerns about the size, scale, position and layout of the space: it was too small, too manicured, and the positioning made it a private space to the mews houses. The new design is even worse.

H. Proposal out of keeping with the Conservation Area

The proposal brings a completely new pattern of housing to the area. Currently, bay-windowed tenements with undulating facades prevail. The flat facades of the townhouses is out of place in the architectural context. Furthermore, there is no precedent in the local area for mews houses.