

Alex Scott - RE: Pinewood/ Hazledene ref 120029

From: william sell [REDACTED]
To: Alex Scott <ascott@aberdeencity.gov.uk>, community council link email add
[REDACTED]
Date: 25/04/2012 00:26
Subject: RE: Pinewood/ Hazledene ref 120029

Dear Mr Scott

We object to the planning application being considered when the land still belongs to Aberdeen City council and is in effect in public ownership. We are of the opinion that this may also be of concern to Audit Scotland. We further submit that no planning application should be granted until the site is sold for its market price.

Yours sincerely
William Sell

Date: Thu, 19 Apr 2012 14:15:10 +0100
From: ASCOTT@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Pinewood/ Hazledene ref 120029

We have now received amended plans for this development which can be viewed on the application portal. There does not appear to have been any comment received from the community council but it is still open to make comments including the amended plans.

Alex Scott
Senior Planner
Planning and Sustainable Development
enterprise Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB
Tel. [REDACTED]
M. [REDACTED]

>>> william sell [REDACTED] 03/04/2012 12:12 >>>
Dear Mr Scott

Thank you for your reply.

As statutory consultees, we feel that we have a public duty to advise you that it is our wish to be notified of any changes to the pace of development on this site. Especially considering the controversy that has surrounded this planning application.

We consider that it is in the public interest that we are kept abreast of any alterations to the planning application and any variations from the original outline approval.

Yours sincerely
William Sell

Chair
Craigiebuckler and Seafield Community Council

Date: Tue, 3 Apr 2012 10:16:21 +0100
From: ASCOTT@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Pinewood/ Hazledene ref 120029

with reference to your recent e-mail an application for the development of this site was submitted on 10 January 2012 for approval of matters specified in the earlier planning permission in principle and showing details of the first phase of 50 dwellings. The application has not yet been determined and will require to be reported to the Development Management sub-committee, probably in May. As the application has been in for 3 months any comment should be made immediately

Alex Scott
Senior Planner
Planning and Sustainable Development
enterprise Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB
Tel. [REDACTED]
M. [REDACTED]

"IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail (including any attachment to it) is confidential, protected by copyright and may be privileged. The information contained in it should be used for its intended purposes only. If you receive this e-mail in error, notify the sender by reply e-mail, delete the received e-mail and do not make use of, disclose or copy it. Whilst we take reasonable precautions to ensure that our emails are free from viruses, we cannot be responsible for any viruses transmitted with this e-mail and recommend that you subject any incoming e-mail to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this e-mail or its attachments, neither this e-mail nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing e-mail is subject to regular monitoring.

29 Monymusk Terrace
Craigiebuckler
Aberdeen AB15 8NX

Your ref. Application 120029

12th February 2012

Aberdeen City Council
Planning & Sustainable Development
Enterprise Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
8th Floor
St. Nicholas House
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1GY

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008

Site between Countesswells Road, Hazledene Road, Pinewood Countesswells, Aberdeen.

Original Proposed residential development to accommodate circa 250 plots and 3 No. Neighbourhood shop units.

Revised Proposal-the application demonstrates an overall site strategy for 350 dwellings, and 2 retail units, and a Detailed application for Phase 1 of 50, dwellings

Application Ref: A8/0530 – Application No. 120029

I respond to the invitation to engage and represent my opposition to the development proposed above,

I understand that several of my neighbours have been unaware of the new and revised application, and to some extent the concerns I outline are shared by many of them.

The points of issue and concern are expressed on the accompanying pages.

Roy Summers

REPRESENTATION – PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 120029

No. of Houses proposed 350 dwellings + 2 retail units

The development proposed is too intense as it was considered **too intense** with the previous application at 270 houses and 3 retail units.

Traffic

I raise concerns over adequacy of the development with 350 houses where adequate allowance of space is available to provide for 2 cars/house minimum off road parking. How are the buses going to move around this area with the congestion of on street parking.

The development could well bring 800 to 1,000 vehicles including buses into the area daily. Add all this to the narrow Countesswells road which is already very busy with commuter traffic from the West into and out of the City. How is all this going to operate within restricted capacities..

Site

Surface Storm Water

Northern Soil Surveys Ltd. Site Investigation Report – Ref Conclusions P.10

Para 3 . refers to the prudence ” to carry out a more detailed survey as some weaker strata may exist that were not picked up in this limited investigation”

Given the amount of marshy land in this area and the network of underground springs, I would have to question whether enough research into the impact of the water throughout this site is fully understood in terms of what effect the development will have not only on its own proposed housing programme, but also on the existing housing adjacent to the site.

I understand from neighbours who have been in occupation since the building of the existing properties that there was a considerable accumulation of water in the foundations of the existing houses when they were first built, and that draining of the foundations of those properties took 2 – 3 weeks.

Footpath

Plan shows the footpath on the submitted plan to run quite close to all the existing and adjacent properties. This will have a **clear impact on the limited privacy and security of the adjoining and existing properties**. Currently with the fields now opened up to the public, for dog walking horse riding, walking, the number of through ways along the planned streets, and the considerable network of paths within the plan illustrates that there is more than an adequate provision of through routes. There is no real need for an additional footpath along the proposed line between the north and south corners, as there is now a clear and formal route through the most north easterly street taking foot traffic to the north eastern ‘detention basin’ on the plan.

At present the noise from existing passers by in the open field is sufficiently loud that frequently we cannot hear our television nor carry on conversation with the door open due to dogs barking, and their owners stopping to chat at the boundary wall. The real concern is that the line of the path shown on the development plans will result in even more passers by passing closely to the

back doors of the existing properties. Most residents live at the rear of their properties, and the new development will now immediately impose upon their existing privacy with the increase in passing 'traffic', noise, and the overlooking by the 3 storey properties. Some reasonable adjustment is needed here, as there is a high likelihood of the usual nuisance problems which require constant intervention by the police and other agencies.

Many of the current properties, are occupied by older people whom I know to feel very vulnerable and will feel even more insecure with the environment which the path will create. Past experience has seen episodes of abusive youngsters shouting swearing and throwing objects into the gardens, and at the windows. I should like to see this situation eliminated or at the very worst minimized with no formal route along the boundary wall with existing properties as currently proposed and to have no path along this route..

It may be an option to re route the proposed path west to the property line of the new houses and to establish the shelter belt planting strip between the most westerly line of the re routed path and the tree protection fence at the boundary wall of the existing properties with security shrubs e.g. pyrocantha, berberus . This would give some security and privacy to the existing residents, from the through traffic encouraged by this plan.

Housing Types

There is a mixture of house styles proposed. The most concerning being the 3 storey houses. Which will be much taller than any existing property in the affected neighbourhood and inconsistent with existing property styles.

There appears to be no rationale for locating these 3 storey properties, the tallest in the plan, where they are sited to overlook the existing properties.

This has a high negative impact on the current amenity of the existing properties, resulting in the loss of privacy to current householders. Surely it would be practical to have the normal 2 storey properties located on the currently proposed 3 storey sites, with the 3 storey properties located looking toward Hazledene Road where there are no properties vulnerable to loss of amenity.

It would show a little consideration for the current householders, and reduce some of the intensity which this development will bring to the existing neighbourhood.

Fencing

The line of the fencing protecting the trees in place stops 3/4 way along the drystane dyke wall, at the rear of my own property, and I request that this fence be extended a further 30 yards to the North to protect, the mature existing hedge shrubbery thereby supporting the protections requested in line with the security and privacy issues already raised.

The Detention 'Basins'

Concerns are also raised with regard to the 'detention basins', and their functionality I am concerned that the 2 water detention basins shown in the plan, , will give provide further support to the existing rat population at the proposed site particularly at the north basin where it adjoins the Denburn. Also what plans do the council and developer have in place to control and manage this environmental issue?

Environment & Pests.

What impact will the introduction of the detention basin features have on the existing brown rat population which appears to reside at the north end of the development site where it meets the Denburn stream? I raise the concerns with regard to the impact the proposed development, and the detention basins will have in respect to the vermin issue.

At the end of January 2012 we experienced the appearance of rats the boundary wall of the site and reported this to the appropriate council dept., as was done on previous occasions. This is a problem which continues to exist, and which needs to be addressed in relation to the impact which the present development may have on the threat of rats to the current housing, and gardens

Additionally what effect will the new enlarged recycling centre have in relation to the vermin in this area, particularly where food waste may be left at the recently approved recycling centre? How will the council control and manage such issues?

The need for housing within the objectives of the Council's Development Plan is both well documented and understood in the interests of inward investment for the City, but this needs to be managed in a responsible manner while maintaining some degree of sensitivity to the impact that the issues raised here have upon the present balance between the Hazlehead Park lands, and the existing residents, and their quality of life.

Roy Summers – 12th February 2012

City Development Services Letters of Representation	
Application Number:	20029
## RECEIVED 15 FEB 2012	
Dev. (Part):	Dev. (Cont):
Case Officer Initials:	ADS
Date Acknowledged:	17/02/12

PI - Planning Application 120029

From: "Karin Rebecca" [REDACTED]
To: <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
Date: 12/02/2012 10:21
Subject: Planning Application 120029

Planning Dept
 Aberdeen City Council

Sir

We the undersigned wish to strongly object to planning application 120029 dated 24th January 2012. We have a number of objections but the first is that this application was submitted whilst the area in question was still designated as green belt in the City Plan. The new plan was not adopted by the Council until after the 24th January. Surely therefore this speculative application should be returned to the applicants for re-submission? That aside, our other concerns are as follows:

Objection 1: The area should be retained as green belt. The area in question links Countesswells Road and Pinewood to Hazlehead Park and is an amenity enjoyed by all residents of the area as it has a significant visual impact in keeping with Hazlehead Park, an outstanding public amenity. Its loss would be great for the local residents. There are also many mature trees in the area which will be endangered by this application as well as endangering the local wildlife who currently use these trees as part of their natural habitat.

Objection 2: We believe the increased traffic would be excessive for this area of Countesswells Road and potentially dangerous due to the long established Robert Gordon's College Sports Playing Field being directly opposite the site (and potentially one of the development's more obvious entrances). This must be considered and a suitable traffic solution identified and paid for by the developers. Please consider this issue seriously as part of the application as this is a frequently used and busy entrance which already causes traffic problems on a regular basis.

Objection 2A: There is also already an excessively busy road which is used as a main road into and out of Aberdeen city; there would need to be improvements to the application's entrances and exits in this regard as well. The entrance potentially will join Countesswells just as the road is deregulated from 30 miles per hour traffic. The potential for accidents is therefore great.

Objection 3: The application is for a phased development of 350 dwellings and 2 retail units with only a detailed application for the first phase, ie that of 50 dwellings. The applicant should not be allowed this phased approach and should be providing a detailed application for the whole development so that all those affected can comment on the whole development rather than as currently.

Objection 4: 50 houses for phase 1 is, in our view, over development of the site under consideration.

Objection 5: There is little capacity in the local schools for children from 350 houses or even 50 houses.

Objection 5A: There is no local amenity for children from 50 houses.

Objection 6: There is no clarity around the use of the retail units; if these are for shops for the use of the local residents, what types of shops or stores are these to be? If for some other purpose, this needs to be detailed.

Objection 7: Such over development will probably result in excessive noise pollution which would be a further loss of amenity for all residents currently living in the area.

Objection 8: There are a considerable number of electricity pylons within the area which in all probability will affect the development in some degree; this appears not to have been considered in the first phase of application and therefore must be addressed before permission is granted.

We would ask you to reject this planning application and retain the area as a local amenity for the current residents. To summarise we object to the proposal due to the size, nature and location of the application with its significant effects in terms of visual intrusion and potential noise impacts. We believe our quality of life will be adversely affected by the application unless it is amended appropriately.

Yours sincerely

Karin N Rebecca
 Edward R Rebecca
 10th of 223 Countesswells Road, Aberdeen, AB15 7RD

Sunnyside,
Countesswells Rd
Aberdeen
AB15 8AS.

Dear Sir, Madam,
I have just read the
notice for planning application
& development of the site (application
no 120029) between Haylidene
Pinewood & Countesswells and am
very disappointed, and am
completely opposed to it
I am 86 years of age and
have lived on Countesswells Rd.
for 50 years. Countesswells Rd.
used to be a quiet rural
road - used by walkers
joggers and cyclists, now it
is a rat run used by
commuters.

Building 350 more houses
is the last straw, Aberdeen
is not the place I remember.

Countryside Rd is one of the last areas to remain a green area, surrounding our city. It is still a haven for wildlife birds, fescus & deer.

Building a further 350 houses is destroying one of the last remaining green ^{areas} for wet.

- just for money.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

"Sunnyside"
Countesswells Rd,
Aberdeen
AB15 8AS.
5/2/12.

Aberdeen City Council
Planning Reception, Planning & Sustainable Development

Dear Sir/Madam,

Reference - 120029 - Development between
Countesswells Rd & Hazeldene Road

Further to your correspondence regarding the above mentioned planning application for 350 homes/2 Retail Units between Countesswells & Hazeldene, I am writing to object.

In the first instance I can not imagine how anyone can think that Countesswells Rd or Hazeldene Rd, being more rural routes are suitable for the immediate increase in traffic that this application would

undoubtedly cause.

Three hundred & fifty houses would put a minimum of 700 more cars on the road, as most households nowadays have 2 cars & some here in the West End even 3.

Countesswells is already a very dangerous road with ^{out} pavements or lights or speed limits. An increase in traffic is only going to create a more dangerous situation.

At peak traffic times, between 7.30-9.30am & 4.30-6.30pm traffic is nose to tail. Most cars are travelling at ridiculous speeds & will stop for nothing. I have frequently been forced right into the edge because the cars will not halt for a pedestrian & some travel so fast that they hardly notice anyone walking on the road.

There are many minor accidental bumps to cars which go unreported.

I can not think that this is a good plan so close to Robert Gordon's

playing fields.

Nor is it going to be a good idea when Robert Gordon's hold their many special events at the field such as Sports Days, Rugby Matches, Cricket Matches etc which in itself creates extra traffic/congestion & extra need for parking.

There is also the environmental issue to be considered. This is a very high density of housing for an area which has previously been designated as Green Belt Land.

Where does all this building end and where we to lose all our Green Field sites? Does Aberdeen City Council not wish to boast about how clean & green it is?

Airghall Primary School was rebuilt only a few years ago and I believe it is already full, so where will all the new children be educated?

I feel that this is a very ill-thought out plan with little thought for either the New residents or the older residents of this area.

It would appear that those who will make the greatest gains will be those who propose & carry out the developments.

I hope that you will give due consideration to my feelings & hope that perhaps this planning application may be refused.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature] (M.A. Hons.,
LTCL)

①

"Sunnyside"
Countesswell Rd
Aberdeen
AB15 8AS
1/2/12.

Aberdeen City Council,
Planning Reception,
Marischal College, (Application
No 120029)
Dear Sir/Madam,

I have received

notification this morning
of the proposed development
and planning application of
the site between Hazledene.

18/0530 and Pinewood

A7/2178 by Allyn Ltd for

550 dwellings, & 2 retail units.

2) I am totally opposed to this application. It has obviously been poorly thought out.

As you will see I live very near to the proposed development (at "Sunnyside" cottage just beyond Robert Jordan's playing fields) and experience first hand & on a daily basis the traffic problems which already face this area.

Countesswells Road is basically a rural country road with no pavements, no lighting and no speed control. It is however, already

3) used as a "rat run" for all traffic travelling into + out of Aberdeen city, wishing to avoid the congestion of the North Deeside Road + the Kingswells + Hazlehead Road.

This has led to congestion + overuse of Countesswells Road. The traffic speeds average 60-80 miles per hour. Between the hours of 7am to 9:30am + 4pm to 6:30pm the traffic is non stop + going at excessive speeds in both directions.

Many cars will ^{not} stop for anyone or anything. + it is very dangerous.

Almost on a daily basis
he hears the sound of police
ambulance sirens & many
accidents go unreported to the
police.

I had a small wall in
front of my property knocked
down & totally destroyed by
one such driver only two
months ago. It was only
rebuilt two weeks ago.

One frequently finds dead
animals - foxes, deer & on one
occasion a horse had to be
put down as result of driver
who refuse to slow down.

5) This is the situation as it exists now. It is obvious no thought has been given to his pre-existing problem by the developers. Add to his existing problem the traffic from a further 350 dwellings (which could increase the traffic on Countesswell Road by anything between 350 + 700 cars given that the average house in this area has between 1 and three cars) this would bring traffic to a standstill in all directions

Hazledene & surrounding roads ^{are} also totally unsuited

2) to this volume of traffic & Countesswells Road would definitely bear the burden of the increase.

Building a further 350 houses is both fullhardy & extremely dangerous. proposal. There have been dozens of minor accidents on all the minor roads - roads linking Countesswells & Craigton Roads / Countesswells to Gulls & Bieldside Roads / the top of ~~Boulds~~ Brae etc.

Add an additional volume of even 350 cars & you have created potential for

7) accidents of a more severe nature. Widening Countesswells Road will have no effect because it is the network of minor roads (already mentioned) linking Countesswells, Traugton + Hazledene which is the problem - all totally unsuited to the volume of traffic they at present required to absorb.

It is a lessening of traffic we require not a huge increase. I remember when people used to go for a Sunday walk in Countesswells Road. Now, nobody dares.

3) Add to those problems the traffic from a further 350 houses & you have a recipe for disaster.

Sadly it will take fatalities before the seriousness of the situation is realized & the fardhardness of building any more houses in this area is realized.

Yours faithfully

MA.