

Mr & Mrs J D Bamber  
117 Newton Drive  
Blackpool  
FY3 8LZ

27 November 2014

Councillor Andrew Stansfield  
Blackpool Town Hall  
Blackpool

Dear Andrew

I am writing on behalf of myself, my family and the other residents in the surrounding properties, to register our objections to this development which was turned down a couple of months ago as it has been on numerous occasions in the past 6 years. I have tried to minimise as much as possible and it is my intention to speak at the town hall on the day.

#### **Loss of Privacy**

We at 117, occupants of flats on west side of 121 and houses opposite at 156 for example will all suffer a loss of privacy from balconies and higher adjacent windows.

#### **Flooding at Rear and Loss of Green Area**

The gardens at the rears of Newton Drive and North Park Drive are prone to flooding after heavy rain and ours at 117 is the worst affected. See attached pictures. If the garden to 119 is concreted over this will reduce its ability to hold water and increase the problem in our garden. The area is also home to a wide variety of wildlife.

#### **Access to the Rear**

The access road to the rear is not wide enough to allow two cars therefore the likelihood is that cars will have to stop and reverse creating noise problems especially to 117, being so close to this property.

The road traffic officer states that cars will have to reverse a considerable distance as it is 65 metres in length. Even if an area at rear is provided as a passing point it will only slightly reduce the length of reversing.

Reverse is a noisy high pitched gear especially when used between two properties, which will increase the noise level and force it to reverberate, this could be at any time of day or night and will undoubtedly wake anyone from 117, the new flats at 119 and possibly Regency Court, this will greatly affect the amenity of these properties.

There is a provision for 18 car parking spaces, including the garages, yet the Traffic Officer believes that there will be only approximately 8 cars use the road per day. Two bedroom flats are likely to have 2 cars plus visitors, surely the figure will be nearer to 20 cars per day!

The increased noise from this and from cars parking, car doors banging at night, and generally use by 7-14 cars and visitors will adversely affect the residents of 117 and 121.

The traffic officer is clearly not enamoured with the proposal and also mentions issues with the provision for visitor parking at the front that the alterations do not improve.

The planning officer, basically, has chosen to virtually ignore this and merely state there are problems but it is acceptable.

How can this be so and how could anyone truly state that they would be happy and think it fair and equitable to have a road running down the side of your house within 3 metres of your window?

### **Increased Traffic**

Newton Drive is a busy main road, used by all the services especially ambulances and this will increase the possibility of accidents with service vehicles travelling at speed, There is a pedestrian crossing directly outside, cars will enter and exit within 10 yards of this, and originally, 6 years ago transport objected to the layout and demanded the crossing be moved and the developers to pay for the works, I do not understand what has changed in the ensuing time and why this is now deemed acceptable Surely there will be a danger to persons crossing not being able to just look down road but also at cars exiting 119, in my opinion this is an accident waiting to happen

### **Roof Detail**

The roof detail requires a section of flat roof that is not in keeping with the surrounding area properties and there is no lift housing shown therefore one would expect it could only be located above the flat roof, worsening the visual aspect.

### **Domino Effect**

If this proposal is passed it gives the green light for properties on the rest of road to be altered into flat accommodation, and this will lead down a slippery slope with the loss of quality homes and gardens, which will be impossible to replace.

The Planning Officer, dealing with this case does not appear to have visited the site. He states that we have a large garage, we do not have any garage, large or small, so he has merely worked off plans and cannot be in a position to give a worthwhile and considered recommendation, due to lack of research.

He also states that the scheme will deliver seven new two bedroom dwellings and that this does not meet HN6 criteria, as they are not varied, yet he chooses to ignore this. He seems to be selective in what he chooses to treat as irrelevant, all to the advantage of the developer.

He says that this scheme will bring a vacant property back to use, but also would a scheme to renovate this property back to its original build of a four bedroomed family home. The Officer states that there is no need for further dwellings, the area has sufficient dwellings already in place, so why would he recommend it be passed when in truth the one thing we do not need any more of in Blackpool is flats. Especially, poor quality ones that are crammed into an confined space of only approximately 70 square metres

Also, our local MP has made a written objection stating his concerns over the loss of quality homes in the area and the proposed development in general

This scheme does nothing for Blackpool, nothing for the area and nothing for the local residents, it is just an example of garden grabbing to try and make a quick profit.

Yours Truly  
David Bamber



