

WLC REF: MIRQ0150

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 17 October 2014 07:44

**To:** Norman, Chris

**Subject:** Public Consultation for Main Issues Report

Hi There,

I am writing to you to comment on the above report which is currently out for public consultation with a closing date of 17 October 2014.

My comments relate to an area of land which is privately owned by myself and my partner at the bottom of Murieston Valley in Livingston and I have a few points to make which I think are important:

1. A few years ago an area of white land was sold on the private market by the Greenbelt Group. Prior to sale, this was divided into two distinct plots - each with their own title. Each was purchased privately by separate individuals. I think it is important that the Council realises this and takes this into account in any dealings regarding the two areas of land.

One area, which is not owned by us is the area of land directly opposite number 32(ish) to 36 Murieston Valley. This continues around the back of existing houses in Murieston Valley and behind existing houses in Moriston Drive. I have no comment to make regarding this land. It is not owned by us - but it is privately owned and I will leave it to the owner to contact you to make any points they feel area relevant.

Our land begins directly opposite number 38 Murieston Valley and continues down the street. It does not border on any houses in Moriston Drive. It does not border on any existing houses on Murieston Valley. This is the piece of land I am referring to in my comments and as said, I would like it to be treated for what it is - a piece of land in it's own right with it's own title.

2. As stated above, the land was purchased on the open market. It is privately owned. It does not belong to the residents of Murieston Valley or Moriston Drive. It could have - if they had chosen to purchase it - but they did not so they have no legal right or claim to it.

3. We have recently had a decision made at Committee to grant conditional permission to build a detached home on our site. This decision is currently in the confirmation process and I am formally making you aware that a section of our land has been granted planning permission.

4. That being said, the designation of our land is white land. Despite claims being made by Councillor Fitzpatrick it seems - to local residents that the land was 'left off' the previous local plan in error it is and has been white land for **decades - through a whole series of local plans**. We want our land designation to stay as it is. The local plan is the local plan. It does not lie. It is a legal document which goes through layers of consultation and ratification and to suggest that an error has been made in the local plan is misleading and irresponsible as it gives members of the public an expectation and feeling of 'right' to something which quite frankly does not belong to them.

5. I do not want to suggest that we do not take the feelings of the local community on board. We have indicated that we wanted to achieve planning for one house and that is all we want. We do **not** wish to put the land forward for housing. We want to build our house and maintain the land we own which surrounds it.

6. The land itself is already protected by a tree preservation order. The only area of useable space which does not have protected trees in the way is the area we are using for our house.

7. We would like to be able to get on with our build without any further upset. There is no need for the designation for the land to be changed because of items 5 & 6 above. Forcing a change upon us would, I feel be using public systems and processes to harass a family who have already been harassed enough to achieve an identical outcome to the one which currently exists. - In effect using a sledge-hammer to crack a nut.

As a final point, I note from the minutes of their September meeting that Murieston Community Council have asked for an extension on the timescale for this public consultation for their response.

I believe that the existence of the consultation and the timescales involved have been communicated very well by West Lothian Council. In fact, I have accessed the information relating to this via Murieston Community Council's own website where the links have been available for some time.

I think that the website, facebook account and monthly meetings of the community council would give them more than adequate time and opportunity to consult with members of the public to complete a submission to time. They should be treated in the same manner as other local bodies and members of the public and should be asked to meet the same timescales.

I think it would be wholly inappropriate to give them extra time to prepare a submission than the rest of the public and think it is improper that they are able to add their comments after the date the rest of the public's information is submitted to public record.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

#### **West Lothian Council - Data Labels:**

**PROTECT: PRIVATE/CONFIDENTIAL** - Contains Personal or Business Sensitive Information for authorised personnel only

**INTERNAL ONLY:** Contains information for council staff only

**PUBLIC:** All information has been approved for public disclosure

**CLASSIFIED:** Contains information that is subject to HMG Classifications of 'Restricted' and above

Link to **Information Handling Procedure:**

<http://webwest1.app.westlothian.gov.uk/its/policies/itsecurity/WLC%20Information%20Handling%20Procedure.pdf>

♻️ **SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary.**