Mr David Paterson Development Control Co-ordinator Development Services Abbotsford House David's Loan Bainsford

> Mr Duncan Smith 28 Braefoot Road Bo,ness EH51 9TT 16/07/18

Dear Sir,

PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AT BRAEFOOT ROAD,BO'NESS Application P/18/0384/PPP

.

I wish to lodge the following initial objections to the application, although I would hope to arrange a meeting once a case officer has been allocated.

1. The proposal contains access road alignment that would be significantly to the detriment of the amenity to me and my neighbours.

The proposed site is on a higher level than my house which would mean any vehicle using the access road would be at roof level to my house. This I would suggest requires a significant retention development which would greatly impact on my outlook both from my front garden and living room window.

My other concern would be road safety. Without significant retention development there is nothing to stop any vehicle which lost control ending up in my living room.

I have noticed that when council vehicles(during grass cutting) drive on the proposed site the noise is quite loud in my living room therefore any access road would create this problem on a daily basis.

Although the access road is not a full width it must be able to be accessed by emergency vehicles.

- 2.The proposal is contrary to the visual amenity and casual leisure provision of the estate given that the site is identified as amenity open space and a play facility.
- 3. The proposal represents "overlooking" onto my property because of the nature of the site.
- 4. The proposal would exacerbate drainage problems which I have at my back door and garden. This has long been a feature of the site and I have had to spend a considerable amount of money to counter this problem. Any site development would possibly render this work useless.

- 5. The proposal would generate further traffic within a restricted area which already has difficulty in coping with the level of modern day car ownership and is therefore contrary to the interests of road safety.
- 6. The proposal is contrary to the original planning consent which sought to establish balanced development within the estate.

I submit these objections and I hope to visit the development services in the near future.

Yours sincerely

Duncan Smith.

P.S.

This letter is a copy of my objections that I submitted in 2005. There is a history of planning applications regarding this site which went as far as appeal to the Scottish Office and was rejected because the proposal would not be consistent with the relevant policies i.e.

NPPG 11 AND PAN 65 emphasise the value of open space, including small informal areas

Unless there have been material changes to policies the original objections should still stand

I notice that in one of the documents submitted with the application that the land is described as flat. This is somewhat of an exaggeration.

Residents who were on the estate from the beginning can remember that the builders used the proposed site to fill it with unwanted material from throughout the estate and it was grassed over.

This area was marked as an open space within the estate and only became available for sale because the original builders went into liquidation

It was bought along with other similar areas within the estate none of which have been developed.