CULTS BIELDSIDE AND MILLTIMBER COMMUNITY COUNCIL



290 North Deeside Road Cults, Aberdeen AB15 9SB 30th September 2012

Ms Jane Forbes Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure St Nicholas House, Broad Street Aberdeen AB10 1AR

Dear Ms Forbes,

121083 – 39 Deeview Road South, Cults – proposed summer house

I am writing on behalf of Cults, Bieldside and Milltimber Community Council (CBMCC) to raise concerns regarding the above application to construct a new summer house.

CBMCC previously commented on application 111716 to construct a new house at the above address. The main concerns were the substantial increase in footprint and massing at the site, plus the impact this would have on neighbours amenity.

The summer house proposed in this latest application is again more substantial than one would expect. We ask that the footprint and the massing be scaled down since there has already been considerable development approved for this site and we would not wish approval of this application to set a precedent for further over development in the area.

Yours faithfully

Christine McKay, Planning Coordinator

Copy to: Councillor Marie Boulton, Councillor Aileen Malone, Councillor M Tauqeer Malik

From:

<webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>

To:

<pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>

Date:

06/08/2012 20:25

Subject:

Planning Comment for 121083

Comment for Planning Application 121083

Name: caroline thomson

Address:

37, Deeview Road South.

Cults Aberdeen AB15 9NA

Telephone:

Email::

type:

Comment : The summer house is so large that it constitutes feu splitting. There are two kitchens in the existing building plans for the main building (application 111716) where a very large raised patio area with panoramic views can be accessed from the open double doors which lead off the kitchen/dining /sitting area. The extensive views were given as a reason for the width of the building, 1.5 meters wider than council guidelines normally allow, and the size and height of the patio, were justified on similar grounds. The neighborhood has lost over 3/4 of an acre of mature trees when the developers (Massie and Dale) ripped and sawed and burnt virtually all the existing mature trees on site. This enormous summer house and hard standing is poor compensation for the loss of biodiversity. The loss of any more trees and mature hedging would be a travesty and against the Nature Conservation Act Scotland 2004 1. 'It is the duty of every public body and office holder in the exercising of his functions to further bio diversity'. Planning Policy context Government Policy Guidelines for biodiversityand Nature Conservation Scottish National Planning Policy Guidance 147 Planning Advice 60PPS2. The landscape plan (lots of rocks, huge patio areas, car parking, building nearly three times the size of the existing house, yew trees (slow growing don't do much to support wildlife the berries are poisonous to children, an odd choice to plant so many in a town garden) rhododendrons (don't do much to support wildlife especially the oines chosen as they have a large amount of ponticum genes in them, laurel, is usually a hedging shrub they are very parks and gardens planting of the 70's and poor compensation for the 3/4 of an acre of mature trees lost, please see Google Earth for mature trees. I do not believe the national planning guidelines outlined above support more hard landscaping and an overly large summer house with full services/drainage/electricity/gas to it, dropped into the middle of the bat run which has been evidenced by yself and the developers bat worker Nigel Astel.

The only remaining trees on the eastern side of the site are the mature TPO trees in my garden, their amenity value and their beauty is partly due to their softening of the existing planned huge building. To have yet more built back drop feels like over development. The area and the amenity of the area is for the enjoyment of all the residents not just the newly arrived property developer, this feels like another greedy building divesting the existing residents and the existing wildlife of its existing amenity. The summerhouse is proposed on an existing bat feeding run and as such would contravene protection guidelines.

Light pollution will be caused as the summerhouse is to be supplied with full utilities, this pollution will effect humans and animals alike.

It has to be questioned why such a large summerhouse has to be considered when such generous planning permission has already been given on the site. Is it the intention to make this an added benefit to the upper flat given it will not have the extensive patio of the ground flat? It follows an existing pattern of development in other parts of the UK where the top floor has the furthest away outside space with garden hut shed usually.

The shear size and scale of the summer house with light polluting cupula is out of step, out of sympathy and does not fit in with the rough build line, and the typical small green house/small summer house/shed or garden features on the street.

Finally, given the pending review of the existing planning which failed to take account of the Bat Guidelines, are the council not about to compound their mistakes? A bat survey should be done if a structure of this size and scale with such a large area of hard standing is to be dropped in the middle of a bat run.

The style of the summer house or small house bears no relationship to the vernacular, what are the architects thinking, this is a street made up of Victorian granite villa style houses with relaxed genteel small scaled garden structures. The character of the street will be ruined by this excessive change at No 39, Deeview Road South. If a precedent is set it will be very difficult to resist in other gardens. There have been no split feu's on this street and the council policy guidelines are very clear they protect from this happening unnecessarily. I hope this is not a further step to enable the developers to build a similar model to their last development on Queens Road avenue wiyh 4 flats and outside summer house!

