

# Public Document Pack



To: Councillor Milne, Convener; and Councillors Boulton, Corall, Cormie, Delaney, Finlayson, Grant, Jaffrey, Lawrence, MacGregor, McCaig, Jean Morrison MBE and Thomson.

Also (as local members) :- Councillors Malik and Malone.

Town House,  
ABERDEEN, 18 July 2013

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SUB COMMITTEE (VISITS)**

The Members of the **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SUB COMMITTEE (VISITS)** are requested to meet at the Town House on **THURSDAY, 25 JULY 2013 at 9.00 am.**

JANE G. MACEACHRAN  
HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

### **B U S I N E S S**

#### **WHERE THE RECOMMENDATION IS ONE OF REFUSAL**

- 1 Land at Woodend Farm, Culter House Road, Peterculter - Proposed residential development (permission in principle) (Pages 1 - 36)

Reference Number – 121581

Note: (One) The Planning Officials in attendance on the visits can be contacted by mobile phone, the number is :- 07802 323986.

(Two) The transport for the visits will depart the Town House from the Broad Street entrance at 9.00am prompt.

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Martin Allan, tel. (52)3057 or email [mallan@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:mallan@aberdeencity.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 1

WOODEND FARM (LAND AT), CULTER  
HOUSE ROAD, PETERCULTER

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
(PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE)

For: John Adam & Son

Application Type : Planning Permission in  
Principle

Application Ref. : P121581

Application Date: 06/11/2012

Officer: Garfield Prentice

Ward : Lower Deeside (M Boulton/A Malone/M  
Malik)

Advert : Dev. Plan Departure

Advertised on: 28/11/2012

Committee Date: 18 July 2013

Community Council : Comments



## RECOMMENDATION:

**Refuse**

## **DESCRIPTION**

The site located to the north of Peterculter on the west side of Culter House Road some 2.3 km from the junction with North Deeside Road and 1.2 km from Malcolm Road and comprises the farmyard known as Woodend Farm. The site, which extends to 1.8 hectares, contains numerous dilapidated glasshouses and poly-tunnels for growing fruit and several dilapidated farm buildings. The structures are scattered in a random pattern across the site. There are numerous trees in the west corner of the site. There is an existing access into the site directly off Culter House Road. Immediately to the east and between the site and Culter House Road are the farmhouse and a disused steading. To the north west and south east are areas of woodland, the latter being a Local Nature Conservation Site (LNCS) - No.54 Peterculter. A small part of the application site falls within LNCS area. To the south west is the recently constructed cattery and equestrian business at Tillyoch, while on the opposite side of Culter House Road are agricultural fields, a small woodland and a house known as Forest Cottage.

## **RELEVANT HISTORY**

Planning permission for the conversion of the disused steading to form two dwellings was granted planning permission on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2011 (application reference P100905). The planning permission has not been implemented.

Planning permission for a replacement house was granted on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011 (application reference P101817). The planning permission has not been implemented.

Planning permission in principle for 14 houses on the site (application reference P111144) was refused on 2 April 2012 following a site visit by the Development Management Sub-committee on the grounds (1) that the proposal, if approved, would be undermine the principles of controlling development and preventing sporadic housing in the Green Belt, lead to the erosion of the character of such areas and adversely affect the landscape setting of the City contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy and Policy NE2 'Green Belt' of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, (2) that the proposal, if approved, would be contrary to Scottish Planning Policy, the Aberdeen and Shire Structure Plan key objective on accessibility and Policy D3 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan by reason that the development would be isolated and remote from the settlement of Peterculter, would be inaccessible by public transport and thus would be reliant on the private car and (3) that the proposal, if approved, would set an undesirable precedent for applications of a similar nature which would result in the proliferation of sporadic housing in the Green Belt, leading to the erosion of the character of such areas and adversely affecting the landscape setting of the City.

## **PROPOSAL**

Planning permission in principle is sought for a residential development comprising 14 houses and associated landscaping and open space. An indicative development layout has been submitted with the application. An indicative house

type has also been submitted, which is a large 1½ storey, 4-bedroomed detached property. The layout indicates access would be taken from Culter House Road to the south of the existing farm buildings.

The application is accompanied by a Supporting Planning Statement, which presents the case for granting planning permission and includes a series of photographs and aerial views showing the application site and the adjacent cattery and livery business. However, it should be noted that the report states it was prepared on behalf of a company (Kinellan Building Services Ltd) that is not the named applicant. Separate documents titled Review of Green Belt Policies in Support of the Residential Development and Bon Accord Cricket Club respectively have also been submitted by the applicants.

### **Supporting Documents**

All drawings and the supporting documents listed below relating to this application can be viewed on the Council's website at - <http://planning.aberdeencity.gov.uk/PlanningDetail.asp?121581>

On accepting the disclaimer enter the application reference quoted on the first page of this report.

- Transport Statement (April 2013)
- Aerial views and photographs

### **REASON FOR REFERRAL TO SUB-COMMITTEE**

The application has been referred to the Sub-committee because the proposal has attracted an objection from the Council's Roads Projects Team. Accordingly, the application falls outwith the scope of the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Roads Projects Team** – Object to the proposal for the reasons set out in the Memo appended to this report. In summary, there are serious concerns regarding the accessibility of the site. Culter House Road is constrained in width and varies in width along its length generally between 4.7 metres and 5.0 metres, although there is one section reduced to 3.0 metres at Forest Cottage. There are no formal passing places. A request for the developer to provide passing places has not resulted in any proposals coming forward. Equestrian movements, as acknowledged by the applicant's agent, along with cycling occur on the surrounding roads. Increased traffic volumes associated with the development, irrespective of the size of the increase, must be considered in this context.

There are no adopted pedestrian routes or any formal cycle routes in the vicinity of the site. Culter House Road is too narrow to accommodate such infrastructure. A route constructed to the appropriate standard, including Safe Routes to School, has been requested from the developer but no such proposals have come forward. The Strategic Transport Fund (STF) contribution required for this proposal cannot be used for that purpose. Its purpose is to fund strategic

projects, not measures required to mitigate the impact of the development on the local road network.

The Transport Statement submitted by the applicant does not take into consideration accident statistics or proposals to rectify the issue of vehicles using the narrow roads.

The site is approximately 1.5km from Culter Primary School, within the distance that pupils would be expected to walk to school. However, that route would be unsafe at present. There is limited accessibility of the site on foot and none that would be considered to meet current standards. Public transport services are at some distance and considerably beyond that required by current Council policy.

The above comments are made on the assumption that a full STF contribution will be made to adequately mitigate the impact of the development's contribution to the cumulative impact on the strategic road network.

**Environmental Health** – The proposal would need to be connected to the nearest mains water supply and mains sewage facilities.

**Developer Contributions Team** – Given the location of the proposal, remote from existing housing and transport routes, the delivery of affordable housing on site may not be appropriate. However, there may be scope for off-site provision. Developer contributions would be required for affordable housing, community facilities, recreation purposes, library facilities, core paths network and the Strategic Transport Fund. An education contribution may be required, but insufficient information is currently available to conclude this matter.

**Enterprise, Planning & Infrastructure (Flooding)** - No observations

**Education, Culture & Sport (Archaeology)** – A condition should be applied to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological works.

**Community Council** – Culter Community Council has commented as follows. This is an upgraded re-submission of a previous application for a development of 14 houses, on a site currently containing run-down agricultural buildings and decaying greenhouses and poly tunnels. Additional land (approximately 3 hectares) would be donated as enabled land for community use as a cricket ground as 'planning gain'. Following the refusal of the application for the housing and approval of the separate application for the cricket pitch, the Community Council would like to find out how this community resource can be provided as part of 'planning gain'. It is not clear to the Community Council how the same reasons for refusal for the housing application, namely non-inclusion in the local development plan housing areas, did not apply to the Waterwheel Inn site in Milltimber.

The application site could be considered as brownfield. The Community Council had proposed Culter House Road to be included in the City's core path network, because of the number of people who currently walk, cycle and horse ride along it – it is classed as 'aspirational'.

The Community Council agree in principle to the proposal for housing plus land for community use/cricket ground, provided that conditions will be applied so that children and adults will be protected through traffic control measures and any other measures deemed appropriate.

It is also noted that the new submission has provided a woodland path to be included between existing trees beside Culter House Road, providing safe access to Bucklerburn Road and School Road without loss of trees. An existing pavement and kerb along Culter Hhouse Road, opposite the development, although overgrown, could be resurrected.

## REPRESENTATIONS

6 letters of objection have been received. The objections raised realte to the following matters –

1. There is no need for further housing in area
2. Additional houses would spoil the character of the area
3. The proposal would affect trees in the area where there are country walks
4. Culter House Road is a quiet road used by walkers

One further letter of representation has been received from the adjacent proprietor, which although not objecting to the development of houses, raises a number of concerns and issues –

1. The houses should be liimited to single storey (bungalows) only and that sufficient and adequate screening is created along the boundary in order to preserve privacy
2. Due to the differences in levels suitable infiltration trenches and drainage will be required to avoid run-off into the adjacent site
3. On-site hazards, such as an unbunded diesel tank, glass houses and disused tyres should be removed
4. There are concerns regarding the safety of the steading on the site, which has had part of the roof removed
5. The housing in close proximity to the adjacent equestrian business, which has regular shows with the use of PA systems, and pet resort will lead to noise disturbance

44 letters of support, of which 39 are standardised letters signed by individuals, have been received. Many of the letters are from people who are neither near neighbours nor live in the local area. The main issues raised relate to the following matters –

1. The land would be ideally suited for a small scale, low density residential development of around 14 houses.
2. The area *“could do with tidying up and because only land currently brownfield consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidating farm buildings would be used.....this housing development is an excellent way to do that for the long term.”*

3. The low density housing with a large proportion of landscaping would enhance the appearance and character of the area.
4. The applicant is willing to donate a significant area of land for community use as a cricket pitch, for which planning permission has been granted. The housing must also be granted for the land to be passed over to the cricket club.
5. There is demand for family housing in the area

## **PLANNING POLICY**

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) is the statement of Government policy on land use planning and includes the Government's core principles for the operation of the planning system and concise subject planning policies. The general policy on sustainable development and the subject planning policies relating to housing, green belts and transport are relevant material considerations.

### **Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan**

The Structure Plan sets out the following key objectives for the growth of the City and Aberdeenshire.

Population growth: to increase the population of the city region and achieve a balanced age range to help maintain and improve people's quality of life.

Quality of the environment: to make sure new development maintains and improves the region's important built, natural and cultural assets.

Sustainable mixed communities: to make sure that new development meets the needs of the whole community, both now and in the future and makes the area a more attractive place for residents and businesses to move to.

Accessibility: to make sure that all new developments contribute towards reducing the need to travel and encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport by making these attractive choices.

### **Aberdeen Local Development Plan**

#### Policy D3 - Sustainable and Active Travel

New development will be designed in order to minimise travel by private car, improve access to services and promote healthy lifestyles by encouraging active travel.

#### Policy D6 – Landscape

Development will not be acceptable unless it avoids (i) significantly adversely affecting landscape character and elements which contribute to, or provide, a distinct 'sense of place' which point to being either in or around Aberdeen or a particular part of it; (ii) disturbance, loss or damage to important recreational, wildlife or woodland resources or to the physical links between them; and (iii) sprawling onto important or necessary green spaces or buffers between places



or communities with individual identities and those which can provide opportunities for countryside activities.

#### Policy H5 – Affordable Housing

Housing developments of five units or more are required to contribute no less than 25% of the total number of units as affordable housing.

#### Policy NE1 – Green Space Network

The City Council will protect, promote and enhance the wildlife, recreational, landscape and access value of the Green Space Network. Proposals for development that are likely to destroy or erode the character or function of the Green Space Network will not be permitted.

#### Policy NE2 – Green Belt

No development will be permitted in the green belt for purposes other than those essential for agriculture, woodland and forestry, recreational uses compatible with an agricultural or natural setting, mineral extraction or restoration or landscape renewal.

#### Policy NE5 – Trees and Woodlands

There is presumption against all activities and development that will result in the loss of or damage to established trees and woodlands that contribute significantly to nature conservation, landscape character or local amenity.

#### Policy R7 – Low and Zero Carbon Buildings

All new buildings, in meeting building regulations energy requirements, must install low and zero carbon generating technology to reduce the predicted carbon dioxide emissions by at least 15% below 2007 building standards. This percentage requirement will be increased as specified in supplementary Guidance.

### **Supplementary Guidance**

The Council's supplementary guidance 'Transport and Accessibility', 'Trees and Woodlands', 'Affordable Housing' and 'Low and Zero Carbon Buildings' are relevant material considerations.

### **EVALUATION**

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) require that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the provisions of the development plan and that determination shall be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan comprises the Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan and the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

Planning permission in principle for a similar development of 14 houses on the site was refused in April 2012 for the reasons set out in the history section above.

### **Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)**

SPP is a relevant material consideration. The proposal constitutes a local development as defined in the 'Hierarchy of Development' Regulations. It is also considered to be a departure from the development plan and was advertised accordingly. SPP sets out the Government's core principles that underpin the modernised planning system. It states *"The system should be genuinely planned....."* and *"There should be a clear focus on the quality of outcomes, with due attention given to the sustainable use of land, good design and the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment"*. SPP also states that the purpose of green belts is to direct planned growth to the most appropriate locations, to protect and enhance the quality, character, landscape setting and identity of towns and cities and to protect and give access to open space within and around towns and cities. It states further that the cumulative erosion of the green belt's integrity through the granting on individual permissions should be avoided. In relation to transport, SPP advises that in order to reduce emissions from transport, there requires to be a shift to more sustainable modes of transport, i.e. from car-based travel to walking, cycling and public transport. It states further that *"Development should be supported in locations that are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport...."* In relation to new housing, SPP advises that new developments should be integrated with public transport and active travel networks (walking and cycling), rather than encouraging dependence on the car.

### **Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan Spatial Strategy**

The structure plan contains a spatial strategy which identifies three strategic growth areas, one of which is Aberdeen City. The strategy acknowledges that although brownfield sites are the preferred option for development, more than half the development will need to take place on greenfield sites, with a consequent review of the whole green belt being required. The strategy recognises the vital need to reduce travel distances and make walking, cycling and public transport more attractive to people. The structure plan specifically requires local development plans to use the spatial strategy to set policies and identify land for development. It also states that planning applications should be assessed against the spatial strategy to decide whether the location, nature and scale of the development is in line with the plan.

### **Principle of Housing Development**

The Aberdeen Local Development Plan was adopted by the Council on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2012. It identifies the specific sites and land to be developed for housing in accordance with the strategy set out in the structure plan. The proposed development clearly does not comply with the land allocations identified in the Plan, which for Deeside are set out in Table 9. Instead, the site is identified as green belt (Policy NE2), overlain by Green Space Network (Policy NE1). The Reporters in their examination of the Local Development Plan considered whether Woodend Farm (Development Option 9/26) should be included as a housing site and associated cricket pitch in the Plan. They stated *"Policy NE2 which applies to the green belt sets out certain circumstances in which proposals for development may be permitted. It is not possible for such policies to address every possible eventuality or potential development proposal in the green belt. In dealing with any planning application, the planning authority*

*would be required to decide whether there are any particular aspects of the site, its surroundings, or of the nature of the proposed development, which might justify approval as an exception to the terms of the relevant policies. Having said all that.....the site cannot be recommended for inclusion in the local development plan for housing development.”* The reason given by the Reporters was that *“the overall vision and spatial strategy of the local development plan is appropriate and that adequate housing land has been provided to meet the allowances set in the structure plan”*. Accordingly, there is no justification for sacrificing part of the green belt for a housing development.

The proposal clearly does not fall within any of the categories of development identified as acceptable in the Green Belt, which seeks to generally restrict development to that which is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, woodland and forestry, recreational uses compatible with an agricultural or natural setting, mineral extraction or restoration or landscape renewal. New housing is permitted only if applicants can satisfy the Council that it is required to provide residential accommodation for essential workers, such as those employed in agriculture or forestry, who are needed to be housed immediately adjacent to their place of employment. This restriction applies primarily to avoid the proliferation of housing in these areas, which would be damaging to the Green Belt and the landscape setting of the City. Clearly it could not be demonstrated that a development of 14 houses would be required to accommodate essential agricultural or forestry workers who must be housed in that area and thus the proposal does not comply with Policy NE2, nor would it meet the green belt and transport objectives of SPP. The Green Space Network consists of areas of land that have particular value in terms of recreation, public access, wildlife or landscape, together with links between such areas. Policy NE1 states that these qualities will be protected and enhanced and that development likely to destroy or erode them will not be permitted. The proposed development would be contrary to the objectives and underlying purpose of that policy.

The Aberdeen Green Belt Review states that in Deeside all the settlements are well contained by the 90 to 95 metre contour on the northern side of the Dee valley. It goes on to state that maintaining this as a northern limit to their development will help to prevent urban sprawl northwards where it would be isolated from the main transport corridors along the North Deeside Road and Deeside Line. The proposed housing development would be just beyond the limit of this contour, being located on the 100 metre contour. Given the characteristics of the locality, woodland to the north and south and a cattery and equestrian centre to the west of the site, the visual impact of the proposed development in terms of long distant views would be limited provided a substantial landscape buffer was introduced on the west side of the site. Notwithstanding, the appearance of that part of Culter House Road would be change substantially and the local landscape character would be adversely affected and irrevocably changed from rural to an urbanised form of development, which would be contrary to SPP and to Policy D6 of the local development plan.

For the reasons stated above the principle of housing on the site is not acceptable. Furthermore, there have been no material changes to planning policy

that would justify making a different decision to that made on the previous application for housing on the site.

### **Accessibility and Traffic Impacts**

SPP advises that new development should be located in places that are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. The site is isolated and remote from the settlement of Peterculter (a view supported by the Reporters) and is not easily accessible by walking and cycling and not accessible at all by public transport. The nearest public transport route would be over 800 metres away. Access to the site by cycle would be difficult. In addition, there are no footways on Culter House Road, which is narrow country lane, thus raising pedestrian safety concerns. The Community Council states that a “pavement and kerb” along part of Culter House Road could be resurrected. However, it would be difficult to achieve a footway on Culter House Road to the appropriate standard, including meeting the requirements of Safe Routes to School, as it could potentially impact on a number of mature trees within the LNCS. The development would be reliant on the private car, contrary to SPP, the structure plan key objective on accessibility and to Policy D3 of the local development plan. It is noted that the applicant draws attention to a partially implemented planning permission for a farm shop, tearoom and children’s activity venue at Woodend Farm, which it is argued if fully provided would generate more traffic than the proposed housing development. Attention is also drawn to the traffic associated with the recently constructed cattery and equestrian centre on the adjacent land (Tillyoch). Notwithstanding, the proposed housing would result in additional traffic on a sub-standard country road, which would not be in the interests of public safety. The roads officer objects to the application as the proposal does not adhere to current local and national policy for accessibility for residential developments and there would be an inherent road safety issue for pedestrians, cyclists and horses and riders in the area. For these reasons, a housing development on the site is not acceptable.

### **Layout, House Types, Access etc**

As the application is for planning permission in principle, consideration of the proposal is limited to the principle of a residential development on the site. Although an indicative layout and house type has been provided, these are not up for consideration. The details merely give an indication of what the layout of the development and houses may look like if planning permission in principle were to be granted. If such consent were to be granted these matters, including precise details of the access arrangements, would be the subject for a future planning application.

### **Impact on Trees**

The proposal would potentially result in the loss of the trees in the western corner of the site. A number of trees could also potentially be affected immediately adjacent to public road. The loss of those trees would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of that part of Culter House Road. It is likely that the impact on the LNCS would not be significant. However, because only an indicative site layout has been provided, the potential impacts cannot be fully assessed and quantified at this stage. The proposal would not impact directly on any country or woodland walks.

## **Issues Raised in the Supporting Planning Statement and Review of Green Belt Policies**

It has been suggested in the Supporting Planning Statement that the site should be treated as a brownfield site as it was previously developed. The Community Council concurs with that opinion. However, brownfield land is normally taken to be vacant or unused, previously developed land within settlement boundaries. The site is not within the settlement boundary and thus is not considered to be brownfield. Notwithstanding, even if it could be construed as brownfield, the proposal must be considered in the context of the relevant local plan policies, which in this case relate to green belt and Green Space Network. The proposal is not an acceptable form of development in the green belt and thus cannot be supported.

It has been stated in the Supporting Planning Statement that the housing would be sustainable and carbon neutral. For the reasons stated above, the proposed housing would not be in a sustainable location, being remote from the settlement of Peterculter. No details have been provided to demonstrate that the houses would be carbon neutral. There is merely an aspirational comment in the Statement. Notwithstanding, this matter does not outweigh the fundamental issue of the principle of housing on the site being unacceptable.

The Supporting Planning Statement also states the proposal would enhance the landscape setting by replacing dilapidated farm buildings and would complement the biodiversity of the area. The condition of the existing farm buildings is not a relevant material planning consideration in the determination of this application and thus cannot be used as justification for housing on the site. To do so, could encourage the other property owners in green belt locations to allow buildings to deteriorate into a state of disrepair in anticipation of being allowed inappropriate development in the green belt. Constructing 4 houses on the site would introduce an urbanised form of development into a rural area characterised by farm buildings, agricultural fields, areas of woodland and a scattering of individual houses. The one exception to this is the cattery and livery business at Tillyoch. However, that establishment is substantially hidden from view from Culter House Road and thus has significantly less impact on the landscape character of the area than would be housing on this site. The proposal would have little, if any, positive impact on the biodiversity of the area.

Attention is also drawn in the Supporting Planning Statement to a planning permission granted at the former Waterwheel Inn on North Deeside Road (Application reference P111606). However, the circumstances of that development are entirely different to this proposal, not least that it includes a listed building that requires considerable restoration work that needs enabling development to fund the works and also is in a more sustainable location being on a bus route and cycle route. Notwithstanding, this application must be determined on its own planning merits and decisions taken by the planning authority on other proposals are not relevant material considerations.

Comments raised in the Supporting Planning Statement regarding the principle of development on the site, the Aberdeen Green Belt Review, traffic impacts and public transport are addressed earlier in this report. As the application is only for

the principle of development on the site, comments made in the Supporting Planning Statement are not directly relevant to the assessment and determination of this application.

Attention is drawn in the Statement to the proposed footpath from the site to link with the existing path through Tillyoch Wood. It is accepted that the provision of such a link could in principle be provided as the adjacent land, through which it would run, is under the control of the applicant.

The general issues raised in the Review of Green Belt Policies submitted by the applicant have generally been addressed earlier in this report. The document, however, acknowledges that the Reporters in their examination of the Local Development Plan stated that whilst it is not possible for green belt policy to address every eventuality, in dealing with any planning application, the Planning Authority would be required to decide whether there are any particular aspects of the site, its surroundings, or the nature of the proposal, which might justify approval as an exception to green belt policy. It is considered there are no relevant material or exceptional circumstances that would justify departing from green belt policy.

### **Gifting of nearby land for Community Use as a Cricket Ground**

The applicant has stated that if the proposed housing is granted planning permission land on the opposite site of Culter House Road would be gifted to Bon Accord Cricket Club in order that the club can establish a new cricket ground for its own and community use and thus the proposed housing should be considered as 'enabling development'. It is not accepted that the proposal can legitimately be described as enabling development as the land could be gifted to the cricket club and developed as a cricket ground (subject to planning permission being granted) without Woodend Farm being developed for housing. This application must be considered on its own merits in the context of the development plan and primarily in terms of green belt policy. Whilst it is acknowledged that a cricket ground would be a new community facility for Peterculter, the possible formation of such a facility does not override the fundamental failings of the housing proposal in terms of national and local planning policy.

### **Relevant Planning Matters Raised by the Community Council**

*Additional land (approximately 3 hectares) would be donated as enabled land for community use as a cricket ground as 'planning gain' – This matter has been commented on the issues addressed earlier in the report in the section 'Gifting of nearby land for Community Use as a Cricket Ground.'*

*Following the refusal of the application for the housing and approval of the separate application for the cricket pitch, the Community Council would like to find out how this community resource can be provided as part of 'planning gain' – The proposal to donate land for community use/cricket ground is a private matter between the applicant and the cricket club. The Council has no role in this matter and cannot require/ensure that this to would occur should planning permission be granted.*

*It is not clear to the Community Council how the same reasons for refusal for the housing application, namely non-inclusion in the local development plan housing areas, did not apply to the Waterwheel Inn site in Milltimber - The circumstances of that development are entirely different to this proposal, not least that it includes a listed building that requires considerable restoration work that needs enabling development to fund the works and also is in a more sustainable location being on a bus route and cycle route. Notwithstanding, this application must be determined on its own planning merits and decisions taken by the planning authority on other proposals are not relevant material considerations.*

*The application site could be considered as brownfield. – Brownfield land is normally taken to be vacant or unused, previously developed land within settlement boundaries. The site is not within the settlement boundary and thus is not considered to be brownfield. Notwithstanding, even if it could be construed as brownfield, the proposal must be considered in the context of the relevant local plan policies, which in this case relate to green belt and Green Space Network. The proposal is not an acceptable form of development in the green belt and thus cannot be supported.*

*The Community Council had proposed Culterhouse Road to be included in the City's core path network, because of the number of people who currently walk, cycle and horse ride along it – it is classed as 'aspirational' – This comment supports the Council view that the road is currently used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. As stated previously in the report it would not be interests of those road users for additional traffic arising from the proposed development to be using the road.*

*The Community Council agree in principle to the proposal for housing plus land for community use/cricket ground, provided that conditions will be applied so that children and adults will be protected through traffic control measures and any other measures deemed appropriate – The issue of the principle for housing on the site has been discussed in full earlier in the report.*

*It is also noted that the new submission has provided a woodland path to be included between existing trees beside Culterhouse Road, providing safe access to Bucklerburn Road and School Road without loss of trees. An existing pavement and kerg along Culterhouse Road, opposite the development, although overgrown, could be resurrected - The potential provision of a footpath link is noted. It would be difficult to achieve a footway adjacent to Culterhouse Road to the appropriate standard.*

### **Relevant Planning Matters Raised in Written Representations (objections)**

1. *There is no need for further housing in area – The local development plan has allocated sufficient land for housing to meet the needs for new housing identified in the structure plan.*

2. *Additional houses would spoil the character of the area – The appearance of that part of Culter House Road would be change substantially and the local landscape character would be adversely affected and irrevocably changed from rural to an urbanised form of development,*

3. *The proposal would affect trees in the area where there are country walks – These issues are addressed in the section above 'Impact on Trees'.*
4. *Culterhouse Road is a quiet road used by walkers - It is agreed that the road is used by walkers and additional traffic on the road would not be the interests of those users.*

### **Relevant Planning Matters Raised the Further Letter of Representation**

1. *The houses should be limited to single storey (bungalows) only and that sufficient and adequate screening is created along the boundary in order to preserve privacy – As the planning application is only to seek approval of the principle of housing on the site, not details of house types (other than an indicative proposal) have been provided. However, should Members be minded to grant planning permission, consideration could be given to the merits and justification, if any, for such a restriction to be applied.*
2. *Due to the differences in levels suitable infiltration trenches and drainage will be required to avoid run-off into the adjacent site – Should planning permission be granted details of the drainage systems would be required as part of a future application.*
3. *On-site hazards, such as an unbunded diesel tank, glass houses and disused tyres should be removed - Should planning permission be granted a condition could be applied addressing any on-site contamination. It would be expected that the glasshouses and disused tyres would be removed safely if the site were to be redeveloped*
4. *There are concerns regarding the safety of the steading on the site, which has had part of the roof removed – This is not a relevant consideration with regard to this application*
5. *The housing in close proximity to the adjacent equestrian business, which has regular shows with the use of PA systems, and pet resort will lead to noise disturbance – It is acknowledged that there is the potential for noise disturbance from the adjacent authorised use (cattery and livery business), in particular from the PA system, which could have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents. However, noise attenuation measures could be employed to reduce the impact within buildings.*

### **Relevant Planning Matters Raised in Written Representations (support)**

1. *The land would be ideally suited for a small scale, low density residential development of around 14 houses – This issue has been fully addressed earlier in the report.*
2. *The area “could do with tidying up and because only land currently brownfield consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidating farm buildings would be used.....this housing development is an excellent way to do that for the long term.” – It is acknowledged that the site has become rather unsightly with a*



number of dilapidated structures. However, the condition of the existing farm buildings is not a relevant material planning consideration in the determination of this application and thus cannot be used as justification for housing on the site

3. *The low density housing with a large proportion of landscaping would enhance the appearance and character of the area* – This issue has been addressed earlier in the report

4. *The applicant is willing to donate a significant area of land for community use as a cricket pitch, for which planning permission has been granted. The housing must also be granted for the land to be passed over to the cricket club* – This issue is discussed in the section above 'Gifting of nearby land for Community Use as a Cricket Ground'.

5. *There is demand for family housing in the area* - The local development plan has allocated sufficient land for housing to meet the needs for new housing identified in the structure plan.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the principle of a housing development on this site is unacceptable for the reasons set out above. Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal. However, should Members be minded to support the application, conditions to be applied should include the standard conditions relating to planning permission in principle, the 'matters specified in conditions' of siting, design and external appearance of the buildings, the layout of the development, the means of access, drainage and the landscaping of the site and also a detailed tree survey and tree protection measures, details of boundary enclosures, restrictions on the hours of construction, a report on potential on-site contamination, the installation of low and zero carbon generating technologies in the houses and a restriction on the areas of the site that could be developed in order to protect trees and reduce the visual impact. Also the planning permission should not be issued until the applicant would have entered into a legal agreement for making the developer contributions.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### **Refuse**

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

(1) that the proposal, if approved, would be undermine the principles of controlling development and preventing sporadic housing in the Green Belt, lead to the erosion of the character of such areas and adversely affect the landscape setting of the City contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy and Policy NE2 'Green Belt' of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.

(2) that the proposal, if approved, would be contrary to Scottish Planning Policy, the Aberdeen and Shire Structure Plan key objective on accessibility and Policy D3 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan by reason that the development would be isolated and remote from the settlement of Peterculter, would be inaccessible by public transport and thus would be reliant on the private car.

(3) that the proposal, if approved, would set an undesirable precedent for applications of a similar nature which would result in the proliferation of sporadic housing in the Green Belt, leading to the erosion of the character of such areas and adversely affecting the landscape setting of the City.

**Dr Margaret Bochel**

Head of Planning and Sustainable Development.

# CULTER COMMUNITY COUNCIL



St Quentin  
18 Hillside Road  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen  
AB14 0TX

1<sup>st</sup> December

Mr Garfield Prentice, Senior Planning Officer  
Enterprise Planning and Infrastructure  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1BW

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning in Principle Application P121581 for 14 houses on the site of  
agricultural buildings at Woodend Farm, Peterculter.**

This application was discussed by the members of CCC at their November meeting and passed to the CCC Planning Sub – group to deal with. The members' comments are as follows

This is an upgraded re-submission of a previous application (P111144) for a development of 14 houses, on a site currently containing run-down, agricultural buildings and decaying greenhouses and poly tunnels. Additional land (approximately 3 hectares) would be donated as enabled land for community use as a Cricket Ground as "planning gain".

Following the refusal of this application (P111144) by the Committee earlier this year, but the separate approval of the cricket pitch (P111863) at the same site visit, the CCC Planning - Subgroup would like to find out how this community resource can be provided if it is part of a "planning gain."

Also, it is not clear to CCC members how the same reasons for the refusal of this application, namely its non-inclusion in the Local Development Plan housing areas, were ignored when the same Councillors, on the same Committee site visit tour gave approval for 18 houses on the Watermill site on the North Deeside Road in Milltimber.

Our comments on this submission remain as previously stated:

- a. *the land where the marketing business was conducted could be considered as brown field*
- b. *CCC had proposed Culter House Road which passes between the farm buildings and the proposed cricket ground, be included in the City's Core Path*

*Network, because of the number of people who currently walk, cycle and horse ride along it and in the 4 district Wildlife Sites adjoining it. It is classed as 'aspirational'.*

*By the end of their discussions, the members of the Sub-group agreed in principle with the proposals*

- for the housing plus land for community use/cricket ground – provided that conditions will be applied so that children and adults will be protected through traffic control measures and any other measures deemed appropriate.*

It is noted that the new submission has provided a woodland path to be routed between existing trees beside Culter House Road, providing safe access to Bucklerburn Road and School Road without loss of trees. Following a recent site visit by members of the Planning Sub-group, it was also noted that there is an existing pavement and kerb along Culter House Road, opposite the proposed development, which has been allowed to become clogged and overgrown and is not currently useable but no doubt could be resurrected.

Yours sincerely

Lavina C. Massie  
Planning Liaison Officer, Culter Community Council

Cc Councillors Boulton, Malone, Malik

# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To	Garfield Prentice Planning & Infrastructure	Date	28/06/2013
		Your Ref.	P121581 (ZLF)
		Our Ref.	TR/IH/1/51/2
From	Roads Projects		
Email			
Dial			
Fax			

Roads Projects  
**Enterprise, Planning & Infrastructure**  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Ground Floor North  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

**Planning application no. P121581**  
**Woodend Farm (Land at), Woodend Farm (Land at), Culter House Road**  
**Proposed residential development (Permission in Principle)**

I have considered the above planning application and have the following observations:

## 1.0 Proposals

1.1 This application is for Planning Permission in Principle for a residential development. The drawings submitted show 14 houses indicatively.

## 2.0 Strategic Transport Fund

2.1 These comments are provided on the assumption that a full Strategic Transport Fund (STF) contribution will be made to adequately mitigate the impact of this development's contribution to the cumulative impact on the strategic network of development. The applicant acknowledges that an STF contribution will require to be made, and it is agreed that should consent be awarded, the final amount will be calculated at a later date.

## 3.0 Access

3.1 Culterhouse Road is constrained in width, and varies in width along its length generally between 4.7m and 5m, although there are sections of further constraint to approximately 3m at Forest Cottage and Cumbrae at 4.2m. At any point on this road, two vehicles will have difficulty in passing each other.

3.2 There are no formal passing places on Culterhouse Road. Drivers may have created informal passing places over time, however these cannot be considered to be part of the road infrastructure and would not meet current standards. I have previously requested that the developer provide intervisible passing places on Culterhouse Road, however no proposals for such have been forthcoming.

Gordon McIntosh  
Corporate Director

- 3.3 I believe the comments from this service in relation to this application and previous applications in the area are consistent. Equestrian movements, as acknowledged by the applicants agent, along with cycling occur on the roads surrounding the development. The increased traffic volumes associated with the development, irrespective of the size of the increase, must be considered in this context.
- 3.4 I can confirm that there are no adopted pedestrian routes or any formal cycle routes in the vicinity of the site. Culterhouse Road is not a shared surface. I consider that the available carriageway space is too narrow to accommodate any pedestrian or cycle infrastructure. While cyclists are able to make use of the existing road space, this does not mean that it is suitable for everyday use by all cyclists. A route constructed to an appropriate standard, including lighting, that is safe and meets the requirements of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) for pedestrians and cyclists has been requested from the developer. No proposals have been presented to date.
- 3.5 The applicant has suggested that such routes would be provided through the STF. This requirement cannot be made through the STF. The STF contribution that the development will require to make is to finance modifications to the strategic road network that are required as a result of the cumulative impact of all development in the area. It is not in lieu of the requirement that each development mitigate its impact in the immediate vicinity on the local road network, or that it must provide a suitable level of infrastructure to meet the sites transportation, accessibility and connectivity requirements by all modes. Planning Gain contributions similarly cannot be used to meet the necessary accessibility criteria.
- 3.6 The applicants agent indicates that a suitable level of sustainable development may not at present be achievable, but that following development of the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route (AWPR) sites close to this proposal may provide the necessary demand for such infrastructure and services. At present there are no sites included within the Local Development Plan (LDP) in close vicinity of the application site. The development must provide suitable accessibility by all modes.
- 3.7 I path to the south of the development emerging at School Road has been identified. This path is narrow, unsurfaced, unlit and unadopted. This situation is confirmed through the content of the Transport Statement (TS). I cannot consider this as an acceptable route to support the development.

#### **4.0 Transport Statement**

- 4.1 A TS has been submitted in support of the planning application. I had requested that scoping discussions in respect of this report be undertaken, however the developer has not instigated these. In addition my request that accident statistics be taken in to consideration within the TS has not been recognised.
- 4.2 I consider that the vehicle trip rates are lower than will actually occur at the site. Nonetheless, I do not consider that junction capacity will be a particular issue, but rather there will be issues relating to vehicles on the narrow roads,

about which there has been limited consideration in the TS and no proposals to rectify.

- 4.3 There is limited accessibility of the site on foot, and none that would be considered to meet current standards. The local schools are within the identified walking distances of the site. The provision in the area would not be considered to be acceptable for pedestrian journeys to school and the developer has made no proposal to bring the infrastructure up to an adequate standard. Public transport services in the area are at some distance, and considerably beyond that which is required in current transport accessibility guidance and policy.

## **5.0 Layout**

- 5.1 I note and welcome that a design led approach will be taken to the layout of the site at a suitable time, should consent be granted.

## **4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1 In light of my comments, I would object to this application for the reasons outlined above.

**Iain Hamilton**

Engineer (Developments and Traffic)

6 Meadowlands Avenue  
Westhill  
Aberdeenshire  
AB326EH

21 st Nov '12

Dr Margaret Bochel  
Head of Planning and Infrastructure  
Aberdeen City Council  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen

Dear Sir or Madam,

LAND AT WOODEND CULTERHOUSE ROAD PETERCULTER ABERDEEN- 14 HOUSES

We object to the application by Kinellan BS for fourteen dwellinghouses and associated landscaping and open space.

This is currently a farm and fourteen houses will change the character of this area

Regards

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Gillian Ridley.

Gillian Ridley



124 Osborne Place  
Aberdeen  
AB25 4DU

August 2011

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
Marischal College  
Aberdeen

Dear Sirs

*Planning Application for 14 Houses at Culterhouse Road, Aberdeen.*

*I wish to object to this planning application as more houses in this area will change the character of what is a farm settlement.*

*This is a quiet road which is used by walkers.*

*Yours faithfully*

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Gavin Farquhar.

*Gavin Farquhar*

(121581.)

6 Migvie Gardens  
Kingswells  
Aberdeen

20<sup>th</sup> November 2012

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
Marischal College  
Aberdeen

Dear Sirs or Madam

Planning Application at Woodend, Culterhouse Road, Peterculter. AB14  
ONS

I object to the planning application for fourteen houses as more houses  
will spoil the area.

They will also affect trees in an area where there are country walks

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Graham Reid.

Graham Reid

**PI - Housing at Woodend Farm Peterculter**

---

**From:** "Albert Middler" [REDACTED]  
**To:** <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**Date:** 09/12/2012 23:33  
**Subject:** Housing at Woodend Farm Peterculter

---

Planning application Ref 121581  
Housing at Woodend Farm Peterculter

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to express my support for the above development of approximately 14 houses at Woodend Farm Peterculter.

The site in my opinion, is a run down area of old farm buildings, and would benefit greatly from a development of this nature. With planning permission granted for the formation of a cricket pitch nearby, and it's proximity to Peterculter, it seems an ideal site for this type of small development, and also will be convenient for access to the AWPR.

I think the development would create a small, friendly community, which would enhance the interest in cricket locally, and will also blend in with the surrounding countryside, and, as family homes, are a short distance from Culter Primary School.

I recommend this development be considered for approval.

Yours faithfully,

Albert M Middler  
Bucklerburn Farm Cottage,  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen  
AB14 0NP

4 Johnston Gardens West

Peterculter

Aberdeen

4<sup>th</sup> December 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the planning application Ref no 121581 for 14 houses at Woodend Farm

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

MMC  
Drumview

Off Malcolm Road  
Peterculter

Aberdeen

3rd December 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the planning application Ref no 121581 for 14 houses at Woodend Farm. There is lots of property for sale on ASPC in Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire and we don't need to build anymore

Yours sincerely



237North Deeside Rd

Peterculter

Aberdeen

4th December 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the planning application Ref no 121581 for 14 houses at Woodend Farm. There are plenty 'for sale' signs up in Culter and Milltimber so I don't think we need any new homes

Yours Faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

**Bucklerburn Farm  
Peterculter  
ABERDEEN  
AB140NP**

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen

30 November 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

**PLANNING APPLICATION REF P121581**

I wish to express my support for the planning application at Woodend Farm. This brownfield site is currently occupied by largely redundant farm buildings and glass houses in varying degrees of dilapidation. Changes in farming over the years have resulted in the creation of these unsightly, unused brownfield sites. I believe that such sites should be used for housing in preference to losing agricultural land or woodland.

This particular site is bordered on two sides by mature trees and the plan for 14 well sited houses forms a discreet pocket development within the surrounding countryside. Woodend Farm was once remote from Peterculter's housing stock, however the Bucklerburn Housing Development in the nineties and the recent Tillyoch Cattery and Equestrian Centre has brought Peterculter's development to its boundary. It is a 4 minute walk on a public footpath to the Bucklerburn Scheme.

I believe the applicant, should this application be granted, wishes to contribute to the local community by donating ground to the local cricket club to develop a pitch and pavilion. Outline planning permission has been granted for this. It seems to me that granting permission for a small development on an unsightly brownfield site near to Peterculter's cricket facility would be a desirable outcome for the area and the community.

Yours faithfully



Alan B Kennedy

**Bucklerburn Farm  
Peterculter  
ABERDEEN  
AB14 0NP**

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen

30 November 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

**PLANNING APPLICATION REF P121581**

I would like to support Planning Application Ref No P121581. The application is for a small scale, low density residential development of around 14 houses at Woodend Farm, Milltimber. The proposed development would not encroach on woodland, trees or viable agricultural land but on land which is currently "brownfield", consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidated farm buildings. The area to the north of Peterculter has lost a considerable amount of woodland and trees recently and I am of the opinion that a development, being low density and containing a large proportion of landscaped green space would enhance the area. The development is naturally enclosed by the existing woodland on two sides and would have no negative impact on the surroundings or current infrastructure.

The applicant currently owns a significant piece of land which they are willing to donate for community use as a cricket pitch and pavilion. No similar facility exists in this area at present. A cricket facility would be a great asset now and for future generations in the Peterculter/Milltimber area.

The developments at Bucklerburn in the last 20 years and the more recent Tillyoch Cattery and Livery have resulted in Woodend Farm no longer being remote from Peterculter. It is a 4/5 minute walk on a public footpath to the Bucklerburn Housing Scheme. The proposed development site being in close proximity to local services and facilities would help to meet the need for family housing in this area. I would therefore request that the land at Woodend, Culter House Road be granted permission for 14 houses along with land being reserved for cricket and recreational use.

Yours faithfully



Anne Margaret Kennedy



Address:

3 FORVIE AVE  
BRIDGE OF DON  
ABERDEEN  
AB22 8TE

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, St Nicholas House  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1BW

Dear Sir /Madam,

I am writing in support of the planning application for 14 houses at Woodend Farm, Milltimber. The Farm lies to the north of Peterculter on Culter House Road. This land would be ideally suited for a small scale, low density residential development of around 14 homes.

Because only land currently "brownfield", consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidating farm buildings would be used in the development no woodland, trees or viable agricultural land is encroached which I feel is a very important factor as so many other developments do involve the loss of such valuable amenities. Instead the development, being low density and containing a large proportion of landscaped green space and planting, would enhance the area and greatly improve the visual appearance making a positive contribution to the "green countryside" character and amenity of the area. It is also naturally enclosed by the existing woodland on two sides. A low number of houses such as 14, sympathetically designed, will have no negative impact on the surroundings or current infrastructure.

In addition the applicant currently owns a significant piece of land they are willing to donate for community use as a cricket pitch and pavilion. Again this is in keeping with a countryside and village atmosphere and something neither Peterculter or Milltimber have. For many years the local Cricket Club have been trying to find a suitable site for a pitch to no avail. They now have outline permission on the site, but to enable this to come into being from a business perceptive permission must be granted for the small housing development in order for the land to be passed across to the cricket club. This provides a great opportunity for the local community to have a cricket facility and resource to develop the interest and involvement in sport for everyone in the area. All this I feel would be an extremely good use of the land and a great asset of immense value, now and for future generations in Peterculter/Milltimber to enjoy as well.

I believe there is demand for family housing in this area and proximity to local services and facilities is good and a small scale development like this is in keeping with the area.

Yours faithfully,



DAVID GAWTON

Address:



TAMMY ADGE  
FOVERAN  
ELLEN  
AB46AX

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, St Nicholas House  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1BW

Dear Sir /Madam,

I feel I would like to write in support of the planning application for 14 houses at Woodend Farm, Milltimber. The Farm lies to the north of Peterculter on Culter House Road. This land would be ideally suited for a small scale, low density residential development of around 14 homes.

The area could do with tidying up and because only land currently "brownfield", consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidating farm buildings would be used in the development no woodland, trees or viable agricultural land is encroached this housing development is an excellent way to do that for the long term. It would greatly improve the site visually and bring it back to life without losing the countryside feel at all. The development, being low density and containing a large proportion of landscaped green space and planting, would enhance the area and greatly improve the appearance making a positive contribution to the "green countryside" character and amenity of the area. It is also naturally enclosed by the existing woodland on two sides. A low number of houses such as 14, sympathetically designed, will have no negative impact on the surroundings or current infrastructure.

In addition the applicant currently owns a significant piece of land they are willing to donate for community use as a cricket pitch and pavilion. Again this is in keeping with a countryside and village atmosphere and something neither Peterculter or Milltimber have. For many years the local Cricket Club have been trying to find a suitable site for a pitch to no avail. They now have outline permission on the site, but to enable this to come into being from a business perceptive permission must be granted for the small housing development in order for the land to be passed across to the cricket club. This provides a great opportunity for the local community to have a cricket facility and resource to develop the interest and involvement in sport for everyone in the area. All this I feel would be an extremely good use of the land and a great asset of immense value, now and for future generations in Peterculter/Milltimber to enjoy as well.

I believe there is demand for family housing in this area and proximity to local services and facilities is good and a small scale development like this is in keeping with the area.

Yours faithfully,



**From:** "Michael Hamilton" [REDACTED]  
**To:** <GPRENTICE@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**Date:** 11/12/2012 12:20  
**Subject:** Application Reference: 121581 Woodend Farm Proposed residential development (Permission in Principle)

Garfield

I write with regard to the following application:

Application Reference:

121581

Local Authority Reference:

Proposal Description:

Proposed residential development (Permission in Principle)

Application type:

Planning Permission in Principle

My family have concerns about the development, although do not object to the development as housing would make the area look significantly better than what is currently there.

You are aware that our property is immediately next to the proposed development and that Mr & Mrs Nairn and Mr & Mrs Adam had concerns about the heights of our buildings previously. Consequently we reduced the levels at our site by some 2.3m or so. For this reason we would ask that the properties on this development are single storey only (bungalows) and that significant and adequate screening is created on the fence line so that our privacy is not affected. One and a half storey would look directly into our buildings and more importantly into our bedrooms and hallway.

Due also to the difference in levels we would request that suitable infiltration trenches and drainage are put in to remove all water from their site into the wooded areas rather than onto our site.

We would also point out that there are a number of hazards on the site which must be suitably removed. There is an unbanded diesel tank which needs to be removed safely from the site. The glass houses and poly tunnels should have the glass removed and not simply buried on the site. There are a large quantity of disused tyres which need to be considerably and environmentally removed.

We are also concerned as to the safety of their existing steading which is partially unroofed and request that this is either made safe or fenced suitably.

A development of housing so close to a commercial equestrian centre and pet resort will lead to issues with noise no doubt and if suitable measures

could be made within the screening to reduce noise then this would make for a happy and peaceful environment for the new houses. We regularly have shows and clinics with the use of PA systems and although this has not been a problem, with houses so close to our development there could be a noise issue without suitable sound buffering.

I hope that if you were minded to support the development that you would put conditions in the approval regarding the above items. If these items do not come within your remit, then can these please be forwarded to the relevant statutory authority.

Regards

Michael

Aberdeen Pet Resort

T: [REDACTED]

M: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED] From%20Email%20Sent>

42 Colthill Road

Milltimber

Aberdeen

Planning Department  
Aberdeen City Council  
Marshall College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1BW

Dear Sir /Madam,

I am writing in support of the planning application REF 121581, for 14 houses at Woodend Farm, Milltimber. This land would be ideally suited for a small scale, residential development of around 14 homes.

The area is dilapidated now and is currently "brownfield", consisting of old semi-redundant and dilapidating buildings and large industrial style sheds. It would greatly improve the site visually and make the area much more attractive and still have a the countryside look about it. A village green area in the middle is an attractive feature as well. At one time perhaps the farm was remote but this is no longer the case with Towerview, Bucklerburn scheme and Bucklerburn steadings as well as the recent Aberdeen Pet Resort, Equestrian Competition complexes being build Woodend is now on the edge of Peterculter and it is a short walk to School Road. The proposed development is also naturally enclosed by the existing woodland on two sides and there is existing houses at the roadside so a low number of houses such as 14, sympathetically designed, will have no negative impact on the surroundings or current infrastructure.

I understand permission has been granted for a cricket pitch across the road and land for this is to be donated by the landowner for this community use purpose, and the development would enable this to happen. This is in keeping village atmosphere and something neither Peterculter or Milltimber have. For many years the local Cricket Club have been unsuccessfully trying to find a suitable site for a pitch. This provides a great opportunity for the local community to have a cricket facility and resource to develop the interest and involvement in sport for everyone in the area. All this I feel would be a very good use of the land and a great asset in years to come as well.

I believe there is demand for family housing in this area and a small scale development like this is in keeping with the area would be a positive thing.

Yours faithfully,  


Local Development Planning Team  
Planning and Sustainable Development  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
ABERDEEN  
AB10 1AB

55 Kaimhill Circle  
Aberdeen  
AB10 7JG

28 November 2012

Re: Planning Application Reference P121581

Dear Sir,

I write in support of the above planning application.

The property at Woodend Farm, Culter House Road, Peterculter has been an eyesore since the Green houses of the Farm Shop were destroyed by the Gales some years ago.

This application for a low density housing development of 14 houses would make good use of the redundant farm buildings which have fallen into a state of disrepair.

This would tidy up the area and clean up the "blot on the landscape" which it has become.

Yours sincerely

  
Mr. D. Cruickshank