

46 Newpark Road
Bellsquarry
Livingston
EH54 9AE

F.A.O Matthew Watson
Planning Application 0740/FUL/18

Response to letter from applicant's architect 14/09/18

I note from the letter that the architect is seeking to try to persuade you that the site is not tandem development. I assume this is tandem development as defined in your supplementary planning guidance. The proposal clearly is tandem development under the definition laid out without that document.

The letter suggests the site does not relate to Newpark Road as the access is not from this road. However, the applicant's house, 1-2 Blythfield Cottages, and its garden are most certainly on Newpark Road. The proposed house is completely behind my property at number 46. It does not follow the building line of any of the buildings that form Blythfield Cottages. Indeed it is located as far away from them as possible within the confines of the applicant's garden. This demonstrates that it is not infill but definitely in tandem with my property at 46 Newpark Road. The suggestion that the proposal completes the cluster of Blythfield is quite ridiculous.

The architect claims that this application will complement the area. How can "a development look as if it has been planned as part of the original" if you propose to clear fell the trees on two boundaries which form the screening between an industrial park and a residential area? The removal of this tree belt would result in the merging of two distinct zones. I do not see this as complementing the area. I also note that no tree or habitat surveys have been carried out. These would be required as the applicant has finally produced a plan showing the true extent of the tree removal. I am sure if this had been produced at the outset it would have resulted in more objections from the community and is a clear breach of the planning regulations.

The fact that the second application is for a smaller scale proposal is meaningless. The proposal still doesn't address the issue of finished floor levels. These would have to be raised in order to accommodate drainage into Newpark Road and as a result the house is going to be much higher in relation to my house than is indicated on the plans.

The new proposal still has the house 5 metres short of the 18 metres required for habitable window separation. The suggestion that I would not have a loss of privacy and that the house would be completely hidden from view is entirely false.

The architect professes that the garden to building ratio is 80:20. When you take the footprint of the house, garages, drives and garden ground retained by the applicant this figure is frankly nonsense. The ratio is nowhere near this figure.

The fact that this proposal is not accessed from Newpark Road but from a shared private road, resulting in an excessively long drive to the position of the house in the furthest away corner of the plot, only serves to highlight the fact that under your own definitions this is in tandem with my property. I expect the planning department to uphold their own guidelines and reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

Neil Lind