

Jill Lind
46 Newpark Road
Bellsquarry
Livingston
EH54 9AE

FAO Matthew Watson,

Planning Application. 0740/FUL/18 Land in garden of 1-2 Blythfield Cottages, Bellsquarry.

This application for the creation of a 0.11Ha (1/4 acre) house plot from their existing garden ground using a neighbours driveway, behind the street line of existing houses, with no frontage onto an adopted road is clearly an attempt at Tandem Development. This type of development is not to be supported by the Planning Department unless, according to the SPG on Single plot and small infill in Urban areas, in “exceptional circumstance on a large plot in excess of 0.4Ha (1 acre) “ when all of the issues of separation, amenity etc may be overcome. For the reason of plot size alone, this application should be refused.

There are however many others.

The applicant's documents for this planning application do not include many mandatory submissions as listed in:

- **The Scottish Planning Circular 4:2009 Development Management Procedures - Annex D. Plans and Drawings**

The following have not been submitted:

- “The proposed development in relation to the site boundaries and other existing buildings on site, with written dimensions including those to the boundaries.”
- “Where a proposed elevation adjoins another building or is in close proximity, the drawings should clearly show the relationship between the buildings and detail the position of the openings on each building.”
- “Include full information to demonstrate how proposed buildings relate to existing site levels and neighbouring development.”
- “Show existing site levels and finished floor levels (with levels related to a fixed datum point off site) and also show the proposals in relation to adjoining buildings.”

West Lothian Council's own Supplementary Planning Guidance - “Single Plot and small infill residential development in urban areas”

These planning guidelines state on page 15, that a number of supporting documents should be included “in addition to the conventional package of plans and elevational drawings”.

The following have not been submitted:

- A location plan, demonstrating the areas spatial character
 - **The plan omits the trees and hedges** bounding and within the application site, using a generic and highly misleading key instead.
- Site levels and cross sections
 - **There are no levels on any of the plans or finished floor levels.** The absence of these make the ‘artists impressions’ meaningless. This is clearly a manipulation of

reality intended to deceive. Especially given the fact that the plot is higher than my garden ground. No calculations can be made of FFL/ridge heights/over shadowing/overlooking without professional topographical survey and calculations. When will these be done? The architects plans state that they should not be scaled from and to use the figured dimensions but there are none. Why?

- A plan of all existing landscape features including a tree survey
 - **This has not been shown to be done as it is not on the planning website.** Indeed a simple look at the plot and the proposed house footprint show why not. There are some 44 trees and other fruit trees which would have to be removed to facilitate this planning application. Despite marking yes on the application form that trees are on the site will be affected the applicants have volunteered no details.
 - When will the applicant comply with his obligations?
 - The tree loss to house ratio of 44 :1 is scandalous.
 - On top of this these trees form the amenity barrier between the residential area of this group of houses and the commercial area in Cochrane Square, Brucefield. The Eurofins facility has two floors of fully glazed commercial space overlooking this proposed site. So no trees, no privacy for us or the new householder.
- Plot coverage calculations
 - **These have not been submitted**
 - This stated the need to have a 70:30 garden to building ratio. This is an extremely large house for the site. I would be very surprised if this proposal is anywhere near this ratio. Is this ratio met?
 - In addition an enclosed private garden should not “be overlooked by others, (however there would be overlooking of this garden space from the commercial unit and seven of our habitable rooms) suitable for sitting out, children’s play, drying of laundry” and “useable private garden ground is defined as being land under the exclusive control “of the householder “within the curtilage of the dwelling”. The applicant showed us the site plan which included him building a garage for himself taking access from the same drive as this proposed dwelling and into his remaining garden. If you look on their submission 18019-P03E, the siteplan the turn in the drive where it would enter his new garden remains. So this area cannot be guaranteed to be any part of the new dwelling exclusively or be used for the garden ratio calculations.
 - Page 9 of your guidelines states that useable private garden ground “should only include ground that has been adequately screened, to the rear and side of the property, and driveways and vehicle hard standings should be excluded from the calculation”. This should exceed 80sqm for a house with 3 bedrooms. Does it?
 - I have also noted that the supplementary planning guidelines state that “Proposals that arithmetically achieve the specified area of private garden ground, but only by aggregating and assortment of irregular pieces of land will not be deemed acceptable”. Using this method may be the only way they could contrive to meet the requirements.
 - As there are no boundary measurements submitted for this plot and it is not fenced off within Mr and Mrs Crombie’s garden, the actual size is a case of your guess is as good as mine. The only marker in there garden is one post.
- Landscape Proposals
 - No mandatory tree survey or any indication of tree works has been carried out.

- This is a requirement in WLC SPG spring 2015 Planning for Nature, Development Management and wildlife.
- When will this policy be observed as the site has a long established mature treebelt, hedges and wild flowers?
- The site also forms a wildlife corridor which would be lost if the application was approved.
- Overshadowing Calculations
 - **None submitted**
 - The proposed dwelling has two habitable rooms and one bathroom facing directly the rear elevation of my property on which has the windows for my seven habitable rooms and one bathroom which are on that elevation. I note on page 9 of your planning guidance states “the acceptable minimum distance between windows of habitable rooms that are directly facing each other is 18m ” and “the distance between buildings is an important factor that has consequences for over shadowing, privacy, daylighting and functionality”
 - The proposed dwelling is sited much closer to my property than this.
 - See diagram of site plan showing a line 18m from my rear elevation.
 - The guidance continues that “new development should not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy or day light to the habitable rooms of existing properties”. This is unavoidable given the size and proximity of the proposed dwelling.
 - “Proposals that would result in the loss of sunlight, leading to over shadowing for a significant part of the day or which would have visually intrusive impact will **also not be supported**”.
 - “It is an established planning principle that the greater part of any overshadowing caused by new building should be confined to the applicants own land”. This is not possible given the position and orientation of the proposal.
- Details of the eaves and ridge heights of adjacent properties
 - **Not submitted**

The applicant has not had the ground surveyed for levels so these have not formed a consideration in the design, nor the ground levels of the existing houses/factories.

What will be the consequence of the drainage plan on the finished floor levels and finished ridge heights, as the sewer is in Newpark Road and the fall required to travel that distance is likely to be high?

What is the significance of the two large gaps in the red site boundary line on the location plan?

Given all of the above required items not shown or submitted, it is inconceivable that any application of this type can be given the go-ahead. As such, neither you nor I can make informed decisions as to exact position, scale, daylight / overshadowing impact or floor levels of the proposal.

I am aghast that neither the applicant nor their agent takes the requirements of the planning process seriously and seems to think that they don't have to provide what the Scottish Government, the council and every other applicant is asked for as standard practice to validate and determine an application. Given that they also failed to provide them in the last application 0307/FUL/18 surely they should have been more prepared this time.

The footprint of this proposed house could easily have fitted behind the applicants own house and negated some of the material considerations I have highlighted. Instead they have chosen to locate it as a tandem development directly behind my home and sacrifice in excess of 44 trees.

Architectural drawings for a proposed house at 46 Newpark Road. The drawings include four elevations: south-west, south-east, north-east, and north-west. The south-west elevation shows a light grey render, natural slate, timber, and residential extension. The south-east elevation shows timber, residential extension, natural slate, and light grey render. The north-east elevation shows light grey render, natural slate, and timber. The north-west elevation shows light grey render, natural slate, and timber. A long south-east elevation from site access shows a white render, timber access gates, and dwelling. An internal 3D image shows a living room with a sofa and a dining area with a table and chairs. A site plan shows the house, double garage, new dwelling, and new access. A diagram indicates the distance of 18m from habitable room windows on each of the 3 segments of 46 Newpark Road and the fact that the proposed house is too close to conform. A table of specifications is also included.

SPECIFICATIONS	
ITEM	DESCRIPTION
1	18019 - P03 F
2	NEW HOUSE
3	18019 - P03 F
4	NEW HOUSE
5	18019 - P03 F
6	NEW HOUSE
7	18019 - P03 F
8	NEW HOUSE
9	18019 - P03 F
10	NEW HOUSE
11	18019 - P03 F
12	NEW HOUSE
13	18019 - P03 F
14	NEW HOUSE
15	18019 - P03 F
16	NEW HOUSE
17	18019 - P03 F
18	NEW HOUSE
19	18019 - P03 F
20	NEW HOUSE
21	18019 - P03 F
22	NEW HOUSE
23	18019 - P03 F
24	NEW HOUSE
25	18019 - P03 F
26	NEW HOUSE
27	18019 - P03 F
28	NEW HOUSE
29	18019 - P03 F
30	NEW HOUSE
31	18019 - P03 F
32	NEW HOUSE
33	18019 - P03 F
34	NEW HOUSE
35	18019 - P03 F
36	NEW HOUSE
37	18019 - P03 F
38	NEW HOUSE
39	18019 - P03 F
40	NEW HOUSE
41	18019 - P03 F
42	NEW HOUSE
43	18019 - P03 F
44	NEW HOUSE
45	18019 - P03 F
46	NEW HOUSE
47	18019 - P03 F
48	NEW HOUSE
49	18019 - P03 F
50	NEW HOUSE
51	18019 - P03 F
52	NEW HOUSE
53	18019 - P03 F
54	NEW HOUSE
55	18019 - P03 F
56	NEW HOUSE
57	18019 - P03 F
58	NEW HOUSE
59	18019 - P03 F
60	NEW HOUSE
61	18019 - P03 F
62	NEW HOUSE
63	18019 - P03 F
64	NEW HOUSE
65	18019 - P03 F
66	NEW HOUSE
67	18019 - P03 F
68	NEW HOUSE
69	18019 - P03 F
70	NEW HOUSE
71	18019 - P03 F
72	NEW HOUSE
73	18019 - P03 F
74	NEW HOUSE
75	18019 - P03 F
76	NEW HOUSE
77	18019 - P03 F
78	NEW HOUSE
79	18019 - P03 F
80	NEW HOUSE
81	18019 - P03 F
82	NEW HOUSE
83	18019 - P03 F
84	NEW HOUSE
85	18019 - P03 F
86	NEW HOUSE
87	18019 - P03 F
88	NEW HOUSE
89	18019 - P03 F
90	NEW HOUSE
91	18019 - P03 F
92	NEW HOUSE
93	18019 - P03 F
94	NEW HOUSE
95	18019 - P03 F
96	NEW HOUSE
97	18019 - P03 F
98	NEW HOUSE
99	18019 - P03 F
100	NEW HOUSE

Jill Lind