

## **EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL**

**CENTRAL LOCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE: 27 JUNE 2003**

**03/0285/FL: PROPOSED NEW-BUILD ONE AND A HALF STOREY  
DWELLINGHOUSE WITH 2 NO. PARKING SPACES AT 86 IRVINE ROAD/8  
HOLLY PLACE, KILMARNOCK BY MR & MRS MILLIGAN**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET**

#### **1. DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION**

1.1 It is proposed to erect a 1½ storey (4 apartment) dwellinghouse on the site facing onto Holly Place. The application site includes 100 square metres of ground belonging to 8 Holly Place. The house will have a bay window feature to the front and one dormer window to the rear with 2 velux windows. All upper level windows to the rear will have opaque windows. The proposed external finishes comprise a facing brick base course and smooth render and concrete roof tiles.

The applicant who owns and occupies 86 Irvine Road, details that 100 square metres of secluded garden space will be provided to both properties. Boundary treatment will comprise a dividing 1.8 metre brick and timber wall and the applicant intends to have an open front garden to the new dwellinghouse and will provide inward opening gates onto Loanfoot Avenue with 2 car parking spaces at each property. A footpath is to be provided along Loanfoot Avenue to meet Irvine Road.

The applicant has lodged information in support of this application and states that he believes that the circumstances in the immediate area are conducive to the construction of a dwellinghouse which is of a size and style in keeping with Holly Place and the Grange Estate. He makes the following points:-

- Prior to lodging the planning application, the applicant entered into pre-application discussion with this Division and received positive feedback. He lodged his application on this basis and now feels aggrieved that transfer of the case to another planning officer has resulted in a different approach.
- The applicant considers that the proposed development meets the Council's Design Guidance. For example, the applicant submits that sufficient garden space has been provided, there are no overshadowing/privacy implications, sufficient car parking standards, etc. The applicant considers that sub-division of garden ground is an established method of development in an area that does not have an availability of ground for private self-build development.
- The existing houses in the Grange, are deliberately of a variety of design/building styles and Holly Place is a perfect example of this approach. The applicant believes that the design of the proposed house is fully in keeping with Council policy and will fit in well with the diverse range of house styles. Furthermore the relationship between the proposed house and others on Irvine Road is such that

the different house styles (mix of Council houses and semi-detached red sandstone) are not visually compromised.

- The existing properties have substantial front and rear gardens and no. 8 is larger than the other properties in the street. It is not surprising that any corner site will have a different shaped garden to others. In particular, the newly constructed house at 20 Holly Place and No. 18 are also different from all others in the vicinity. In terms of the rear gardens of the existing and proposed houses the size and shape of these are similar to those properties on Irvine Road between Grange Terrace and Loanfoot Avenue in that they are long and narrow, generally in keeping with some other houses in the surrounding area. The rear gardens of the properties at 18 and 20 Holly Place are significantly smaller than the original houses and of non-uniform shape.
- Despite the objections the applicant states that the house design is conventional and will not detrimentally affect other residents. It is believed that the majority of objections are not on a planning basis.
- Sub-division of garden ground has been an established method of development and has been carried out at 6 Irvine Road at the junction of Beech Avenue. This site reflects many circumstances that are almost identical to those contained within the present application:-
  - the distance between properties is up to 50% more at Holly Place than at Beech Avenue.
  - the layout of the front garden of the present site being open in character is more visually appealing than at Beech Avenue.
  - Holly Place unlike Beech Avenue has a history of allowing single plots to be sub-divided.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

**2.1 It is recommended that the application be refused for the reasons indicated on the attached sheet.**

## **3. CONCLUSIONS**

3.1 As indicated at Section 5 of the report the application is considered to be contrary to the Development Plan. Therefore given the terms of Section 25 and Section 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 the application should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.2 As indicated in Section 6 of the report there are material considerations relevant to this application and they are not supportive of the proposal. The concerns of the objectors are material in the determination of this application. The size of the existing garden ground of no. 86 Irvine Road is typical for the immediate surrounding area. If the application site was developed the existing and new property would retain a relatively small rear garden with an inadequate distance between the rear of the house and the new rear garden boundary such that garden

ground would be at variance with the majority, if not all of the gardens in the vicinity. Therefore the proposed development would be out of character with the surrounding properties. The visual amenity of immediate properties would be seriously impaired by the development, caused by the close proximity of the new house.

### **CONTRARY DECISION NOTE**

Should the Committee agree that the application be approved contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control the application would not require to be referred to the Development Services Committee as it would not represent a significant departure from Council policy.

**Alan Neish**  
**Head of Planning and Building Control**

**Note: This document combines key sections of the associated report for quick reference and should not in itself be considered as having been the basis for recommendation preparation or decision making by the Planning Authority.**

## EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

CENTRAL LOCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE: 27 JUNE 2003

**03/0285/FL: PROPOSED NEW-BUILD ONE AND A HALF STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE WITH 2 NO. PARKING SPACES AT 86 IRVINE ROAD/8 HOLLY PLACE, KILMARNOCK BY MR & MRS MILLIGAN**

### Report by Head of Planning and Building Control

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present for determination a full planning application which is to be considered by the Local Planning Committee under the scheme of delegation because it has been the subject of objection and is recommended for refusal.

#### 2. APPLICATION DETAILS

2.1 **Site Description:** This application is for a site at 86 Irvine Road/8 Holly Place situated to the west of Kilmarnock. The site incorporates the curtilage of 86 Irvine Road and an area of ground associated with the front garden of 8 Holly Place. The site is bound by Irvine Road to the north, beyond which are residential properties, to the south by Holly Place and associated landscaped ground, to the east by Loanfoot Avenue and residential properties and to the west by residential properties. The properties are separated by a Leylandii conifer hedge along the existing mutual boundary.

2.2 **Proposed Development:** It is proposed to erect a 1½ storey (4 apartment) dwellinghouse on the site facing onto Holly Place. The application site includes 100 square metres of ground belonging to 8 Holly Place. The house will have a bay window feature to the front and one dormer window to the rear with 2 velux windows. All upper level windows to the rear will have opaque windows. The proposed external finishes comprise a facing brick base course and smooth render and concrete roof tiles.

The applicant who owns and occupies 86 Irvine Road, details that 100 square metres of secluded garden space will be provided to both properties. Boundary treatment will comprise a dividing 1.8 metre brick and timber wall and the applicant intends to have an open front garden to the new dwellinghouse and will provide inward opening gates onto Loanfoot Avenue with 2 car parking spaces at each property. A footpath is to be provided along Loanfoot Avenue to meet Irvine Road.

The applicant has lodged information in support of this application and states that he believes that the circumstances in the immediate area are conducive to the

construction of a dwellinghouse which is of a size and style in keeping with Holly Place and the Grange Estate. He makes the following points:-

- Prior to lodging the planning application, the applicant entered into pre-application discussion with this Division and received positive feedback. He lodged his application on this basis and now feels aggrieved that transfer of the case to another planning officer has resulted in a different approach.
- The applicant considers that the proposed development meets the Council's Design Guidance. For example, the applicant submits that sufficient garden space has been provided, there are no overshadowing/privacy implications, sufficient car parking standards, etc. The applicant considers that sub-division of garden ground is an established method of development in an area that does not have an availability of ground for private self-build development.
- The existing houses in the Grange, are deliberately of a variety of design/building styles and Holly Place is a perfect example of this approach. The applicant believes that the design of the proposed house is fully in keeping with Council policy and will fit in well with the diverse range of house styles. Furthermore the relationship between the proposed house and others on Irvine Road is such that the different house styles (mix of Council houses and semi-detached red sandstone) are not visually compromised.
- The existing properties have substantial front and rear gardens and no. 8 is larger than the other properties in the street. It is not surprising that any corner site will have a different shaped garden to others. In particular, the newly constructed house at 20 Holly Place and No. 18 are also different from all others in the vicinity. In terms of the rear gardens of the existing and proposed houses the size and shape of these are similar to those properties on Irvine Road between Grange Terrace and Loanfoot Avenue in that they are long and narrow, generally in keeping with some other houses in the surrounding area. The rear gardens of the properties at 18 and 20 Holly Place are significantly smaller than the original houses and of non-uniform shape.
- Despite the objections the applicant states that the house design is conventional and will not detrimentally affect other residents. It is believed that the majority of objections are not on a planning basis.
- Sub-division of garden ground has been an established method of development and has been carried out at 6 Irvine Road at the junction of Beech Avenue. This site reflects many circumstances that are almost identical to those contained within the present application:-
  - the distance between properties is up to 50% more at Holly Place than at Beech Avenue.
  - the layout of the front garden of the present site being open in character is more visually appealing than at Beech Avenue.
  - Holly Place unlike Beech Avenue has a history of allowing single plots to be sub-divided.

### 3. CONSULTATIONS AND ISSUES RAISED

3.1 The Grange Howard Community Council have not replied to their consultation letter at the time of writing this report.

***Noted.***

3.2 Scottish Water, Transco, The Coal Authority and East Ayrshire Council Roads and Transportation Division have not raised any adverse comments on the proposed development.

***Noted.***

3.3 Environmental Health and Waste Management have offered the following comments:-

- (i) Owing to the proximity of the site to existing housing, hours of construction should be limited to 8.00 am-6.00 pm, Monday – Friday, 8.00 am-12 noon on a Saturday and at no time on a Sunday;
- (ii) All drainage and supply connections should be to the satisfaction of the relevant authority;
- (iii) All waste arising should be disposed of other than by burning and to the satisfaction of the Waste Management Authority.

***The requirements of Environmental Health can be addressed by attaching conditions to any grant of planning approval.***

3.4 East Ayrshire Council Administration and Legal Services advise that the Council's Property Department is in negotiation with the owners of 8 Holly Place with regard to the granting of a Minute of Waiver of a title condition prohibiting the erection of any additional dwellinghouses on the plot of ground.

***Noted. This is a matter separate from the determination of the planning application itself.***

### 4. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

There are 7 objectors to the proposed development. The points raised are as follows:-

4.1 The location of the main entrance to the property is located on the double bend to Holly Place and could lead to more on-street car parking that could be problematic for large vehicles such as, refuse collection, emergency vehicles and delivery trucks etc. It is suggested that 'no parking signs' and double yellow lines be

a planning consideration. The proposed development will also restrict sightlines at Holly Place.

***The Roads Division have not raised any objection to the application on the grounds of traffic safety or increased vehicular movements.***

4.2 The application site occupied by the applicant at 86 Irvine Road presently extends beyond its legal boundaries. A wooden fence erected by the applicant some years ago has resulted in more ground being occupied by the applicant (approximately one foot in width) and as such, the area for development is actually less than indicated on the plans.

***The applicant has confirmed in writing that his plans have been drawn based on the title deeds and has confirmed that the correct ownership notification in terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992 has been carried out.***

4.3 If constructed the new dwellinghouse will obstruct sunlight from getting into the next door rear garden until midday. The rear upper windows will also overlook the garden causing a loss of amenity and privacy impacting on the enjoyment of this property.

***It is not considered that the proposed dwellinghouse will adversely affect the sunlight or privacy of the neighbouring property at 88 Irvine Road. All upper windows to the rear will be finished in opaque glazing.***

4.4 The proposed dwellinghouse will conflict with the original title restriction prohibiting the subdivision of 8 Holly Place.

***This is not a material planning consideration. The applicant is seeking to waive this title restriction. Refer to the comments of Legal Services in paragraph 3.4 above.***

4.5 Insufficient neighbour notification has been served on neighbouring properties affected by the proposals.

***The applicant has completed the appropriate certification that neighbour notification has been served in accordance with the statutory requirements.***

4.6 As a result of the cramped nature of the proposed development, additional vehicles will result in congestion. At present the current owners of the application site have occasion to park on the double yellow lines on Loanfoot Avenue and any further development will make matters worse as the existing house will have no parking facility.

***The Roads and Transportation Division have not objected to this application on the grounds of traffic generation. Furthermore, the plans***

**indicate that the existing property will have two car parking spaces within its curtilage.**

4.7 The proposed development will require the removal of an attractive mature tree.

**The tree to be removed is a fir tree that is not protected by a Tree Preservation Order.**

4.8 The proposed development will be surrounded by a 1.8 metre fence which is not a feature of the general area and will only emphasise the obtrusiveness of the property.

**The applicants amended plans do not indicate any fencing to the front of the new property.**

4.9 If permission is granted, it will set a precedent for similar backland development particularly in Holly Place where rear gardens are of a size that could take up to 2 additional dwellings.

**The site is considered to comprise backland development as detailed in Section 5.2 of this report. It is also agreed that if permission is granted in this instance it would set an unacceptable precedent for the reasons stated in Section 4.10 below.**

4.10 The proposed development does not appear to conform with any notion of a building line and would be out of character with surrounding properties in that it will have the appearance of being squeezed into a much too small plot and it will have virtually no garden at all.

**Noted. The proposed development breaches the rear garden boundary with Holly Place and would adversely affect the setting of the residential area and the amenity of the property at 8 Holly Place. It is considered that a feature of this area is reasonable sized houses set in spacious plots. This proposal is in conflict with this feature.**

4.11 The surrounding area is a well established residential area which has seen very little new building over the years and what little there has been, is located in Holly Place without detracting from the overall open landscaping of the area. The new build will be prominent at Holly Place in view of all who live in this area thus changing the character of the area and comprising a dominant feature for several reasons. The house is not in the interests of the area and if it proceeds it would significantly change the character of the area and houses with appropriate gardens:-

(i) All houses sit within established mature gardens and substantial front driveways/pathways. The proposed development will have little/no garden area some of which will be used as a parking area.

(ii) The proposed house is a 4 bedroomed family home although all spare land has had to be utilised including purchasing land from a neighbouring owner. Even then the garden space available to each property is small leading to an increased density and therefore an over-development of the plot;

(iii) A substantial amount of greenery is lost including a mature fir tree and hedging that add to the well landscaped, attractive layout of the established area.

***It is considered that the character of the surrounding area comprises larger properties set within mature fairly extensive gardens. The bungalows on Irvine Road are all set within deeper gardens and to approve this proposal would alter that established character. Both the proposed and existing dwellinghouses would be set within considerably smaller plots than neighbouring properties and would result in the development being of higher density than surrounding properties. Whilst the applicant has sought to attain additional garden ground purchased from 8 Holly Place, the proposed dwellinghouse will have a considerably smaller garden than surrounding properties which would be out of character with its neighbours. Also of concern is the affect of the proposals on the amenity of the dwellinghouse at 8 Holly Place owing to the orientation of this property relative to the application site. It is considered that the proposed dwellinghouse would comprise over-development firstly by virtue of the introduction of a new property that will comprise a cramped feature adversely affecting the general open character of the surrounding area and secondly owing to its location at a corner plot comprising an over-prominent form of development. This would be detrimental to the overall character and high amenity value of the area.***

## **5. ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

5.1 Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this application, the development plan comprises the Approved Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan and the Adopted East Ayrshire Local Plan.

5.2 It is not considered that the application raises any strategic implications in terms of the Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan. In terms of the East Ayrshire Local Plan, Policy RES5 is relevant and relates to the sub-division of existing house curtilages. This Policy states that the Council will be supportive of the sub-division of existing house curtilages for development as dwellinghouses subject to each of the following criteria being met:-

(i) the proposal is fully in keeping with the existing residential character and appearance of the area within which it is located;

- (ii) the proposal meets all the design requirements of the Council and does not create unacceptable damage to the amenity of surrounding properties; and
- (iii) acceptable levels of privacy are maintained to neighbouring properties and to the new housing proposed;

The policy further states that backland development (ie. the erection of any dwellinghouse situated to the rear of an existing building and/or without a proper road frontage) will not be permitted where, in the opinion of the Council, it would adversely affect the amenity of the area, the setting of either the proposed or original building on the site, or the amenity of neighbouring property.

***It is considered that the proposed dwellinghouse constitutes backland development in terms of the above policy. The application site encroaches into the front garden ground of 8 Holly Place and the development would obscure part of its front elevation. The proposal would also result in the loss of the existing mature hedge along the boundary of 8 Holly Place/86 Irvine Road. It is considered that this will detrimentally affect the amenity of both properties and the appearance of the street as a whole. The proposal is not therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of Policy RES5. It is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character of neighbouring properties and more generally the surrounding area, where a feature of the area is reasonable sized houses in spacious gardens.***

5.3 Policy RES22 is also relevant and states that new residential development is required to provide a minimum of 100 square meters of private garden ground.

***Both the existing and proposed dwellinghouses indicate a minimum of 100 square metres of secluded garden ground in accordance with the terms of this policy. Such provision is however inconsistent with the general character of the area in the circumstances of the site.***

5.4 Policy ENV7 states that all proposals will expected to comply with the Council's existing and emerging Design Guidance. The Design Guidance states that developers are expected to follow certain principles when preparing house and layout designs:

- (i) LOCATION – designs will require to conform, compliment and harmonise with the landscape character of the area, the design of surrounding bundings and the general appearance of settlements in terms of scale, form, materials and finish.
- (ii) GOOD DESIGN – designs shall be prepared using best architectural practice in detailing, scale and proportion.
- (iii) MAXIMISING OPPORTUNITIES - all individual house plots shall be designed to maximise the use of private open space around the house for outdoor activities associated with modern living.

***It is not considered that the proposed dwellinghouse complies with the design guidance and as such is contrary to the terms of Policy ENV7. As previously discussed, the development is not considered to be a proposal that will be a complimentary or harmonious feature within the area. It is a site that will introduce a form of development out of scale and proportion with other surrounding house plots and in principle is therefore unacceptable. The design of the dwellinghouse is not however considered unacceptable given the variety of house styles in the surrounding area. As it is situated on a corner site it will though be a prominent feature and will in location and character, be inconsistent with the surrounding area.***

## **6. ASSESSMENT AGAINST OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The principal material considerations relevant to the determination of the application are the site history, the representations received and consultation responses which are detailed in Sections 3 & 4 of the report and the applicants supporting statement which is detailed in Section 2.2 of the report.

### Site History

6.2 The following site history is relevant:

- KL/W/81/16 - A proposed side and rear extension to side and rear of existing dwellinghouse and erection of single garage was granted subject to conditions on 28 April 1981.
- KL/W/81/16A - A proposed lounge extension and bedroom accommodation granted on 11 June 1985.
- KL/W/81/16B - An outline application for a proposed single dwellinghouse facing onto Loanfoot Avenue was refused on 29 November 1989 because it was considered not to be in accordance with the Council's policy on the provision of open space as the site is too small therefore constituting over-development of the site. It was considered that the site was unable to provide sufficient private open space, car parking and provide a dwelling to such a standard as would comply with the Council's policies for such development.
- 98/0417/FL - Erection of a kitchen extension to the rear of the property at 86 Irvine Road extending to some 16 square metres in floor area granted 4 August 1998.

### Consultations Responses and Letters of Representation

6.3 It is not considered that the consultation responses raise any issues that would warrant the refusal of this application. The letters of objection have been

addressed in Section 4 of this report. It is considered that many of the points raised are of direct relevance to the determination of this application. The concerns of the objectors are material and are in line with concerns expressed in terms of the appropriateness of the development set against Policies RES5 and ENV7 of the East Ayrshire Local Plan. Primarily these are the effect of the proposal on the character of the established residential area and the dwellinghouse being an incongruous development within the area.

### The Applicants Supporting Statement

6.4 The supporting statement lodged by the applicant has been detailed in Section 2.2 of his report. Whilst the issues raised are noted, it is not considered that they merit approval of the application given its location.

6.5 The following comments are made in response to the applicant's statement:-

- Pre-application discussion is an informal process offered by this Division prior to the submission and an advisory service. It does not provide a guarantee that planning permission will be granted;
- The provisions of the Council's Design Guidance have been discussed in paragraph 5.4 of this report and it is not considered that the proposal meets these provisions;
- As discussed in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of this report, the dwellinghouse is not considered appropriate in terms of its relationship with the layout of surrounding properties, garden size and general character of an established quality residential area where dwellinghouses are set out in a spacious manner and established with mature planting;
- The objections have been discussed in Section 4 of this report and whilst some issues are not material planning considerations, there are many pertinent points that add weight to a refusal of consent.
- The dwellinghouse at Beech Avenue was granted Outline Consent subject to conditions on 6 December 1982. Detailed approval (KL/W/82/186A) was granted conditionally on 19 September 1983. In granting the outline consent it was considered that the site was of such size to accommodate a dwellinghouse without being detrimental to neighbouring properties. The distance between existing and proposed properties was also considered to be adequate. It is noted that this development took place some 20 years ago and is a rather dated decision with planning policies having moved on considerably and regulations and the development plan having changed. It is however worth noting that the orientation of this dwellinghouse is directly onto Beech Avenue without the requirement to purchase additional ground from neighbouring properties. Furthermore planning permission was refused in 1989 for a house on the present application site on the basis that it was considered to be too small and constitute over-development of the site.

## **7. FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no financial or legal implications for the Council in the determination of this application.

## **8. CONCLUSIONS**

8.1 As indicated at Section 5 of the report the application is considered to be contrary to the Development Plan. Therefore given the terms of Section 25 and Section 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 the application should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

8.2 As indicated in Section 6 of the report there are material considerations relevant to this application and they are not supportive of the proposal. The concerns of the objectors are material in the determination of this application. The size of the existing garden ground of no. 86 Irvine Road is typical for the immediate surrounding area. If the application site was developed the existing and new property would retain a relatively small rear garden with an inadequate distance between the rear of the house and the new rear garden boundary such that garden ground would be at variance with the majority, if not all of the gardens in the vicinity. Therefore the proposed development would be out of character with the surrounding properties. The visual amenity of immediate properties would be seriously impaired by the development, caused by the close proximity of the new house.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

**9.1 It is recommended that the application be refused for the reasons indicated on the attached sheet.**

**Alan Neish**  
**Head of Planning and Building Control**

(FMF/MS)

FV/DVM

17 June 2003

## **CONTRARY DECISION NOTE**

Should the Committee agree that the application be approved contrary to the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Building Control the application would not require to be referred to the Development Services Committee as it would not represent a significant departure from Council policy.

## LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Application Forms/Plans.
2. Statutory Notices.
3. Consultation Responses.
4. Letters of Objection.
5. Applicants Supporting Statement.
6. Adopted Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan.
7. Approved East Ayrshire Council Finalised Local Plan with Modifications.
8. Previous Planning Applications.

Anyone wishing to inspect the above papers please contact Fiona Finlay on 01563 576768.

***Implementation Officer: Dave Morris***

Form TP24

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Application No: 03/0285/FL

---

Location: 86 Irvine Road/8 Holly Place  
KILMARNOCK

Nature of Proposal: Proposed New Build One and a Half Storey  
Dwellinghouse with 2 No. Parking Spaces

Name & Address of Applicant: Mr & Mrs Milligan  
86 Irvine Road  
KILMARNOCK  
KA1 2JS

Name & Address of Agent:

---

DPO's Ref: FMF/MS

The above FULL application should be refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development is contrary to Policies RES4 and ENV7 of the Adopted East Ayrshire Local Plan and would by reason of scale and proportion have a detrimental impact on the general character and high amenity value of the surrounding established residential area.
2. The proposal constitutes an over development of the site and would result in a new dwellinghouse in a plot which is out of scale and character with the general layout and setting of neighbouring properties on Irvine Road and Holly Place.
3. The proposed development would set an unacceptable precedent for the approval of similar developments which would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the area.

**DUE TO ORDNANCE SURVEY REGULATIONS AND COPYRIGHT  
THE MAP IS AVAILABLE FOR VIEWING AT THE COUNCIL'S  
PLANNING OFFICE IN KILMARNOCK. FOR INFORMATION ON  
VIEWING PLEASE CONTACT (01563) 576790.**