

## CRAIGIEBUCKLER AND SEAFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Head of Planning and Sustainable Development  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen

10 Craigiebuckler Drive  
Aberdeen AB15 8ND

12 August 2013

Dear Sir/Madam

Application Number P13055

Applicant: Dandara

**Application  
Reference:**

131055

**Local Authority  
Reference:**

000067879-001

**Proposal  
Description:**

Application for Matters Specified in condition 12 (siting, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping) relating to A7/2178 Planning Permission in Principle

**Application type:** Approval of Conditions for Planning Permission in Principle

Hazledene Zone D E F & G

**Address:**

Hazlehead  
Aberdeen

We oppose the proposed construction of the dwellings on this site, as shown on the applicant's drawing (referred to as Zone D E F and G) because, combined with the remainder of the planned residential development within the Pinewood/Hazledene site, it will generate a volume of additional traffic sufficient to cause congestion at the following locations:- Countesswells Avenue's junction with Countesswells Road, Countesswells Road's junction with Springfield Road and Seafield Road's junction with Anderson Drive. Those junctions were designed to cope with the traffic volumes of the 1960s and 70s and therefore are wholly unsuitable for the extra traffic movements that would be generated by this development.

There is no indication in the above referenced planning application that the Developer is prepared to contribute to any alterations to the above mentioned aspects of the roads infrastructure that may be required to facilitate the extra traffic movements, which will inevitably be generated by this development in combination with the remainder of the dwellings proposed for construction on the Pinewood /Hazledene site.

The Countesswells/Springfield Road junction is already over its capacity during peak times with long queues of traffic waiting to negotiate it.

Countesswells Avenue, presently the only access to the site, is a residential street. The noise of construction would cause disturbance and adversely affect the quality of life of its residents.

The dwellings on this proposed site, when added the Applicant's other planned developments at Pinewood/Hazledene, will impose additional burdens on the health and educational provisions in this area. We submit that there seems to be no indication from the Applicant pertaining to an

intention to contribute towards the additional costs that are likely to be incurred by the education and health services as a result of the localised increase in population engendered by the urbanisation of the site.

Zones D E F and G form part of a proposed development of 350 dwellings to be sited on the fields of Pinewood and Hazledene which feature a number of natural springs. Consequently the land is often waterlogged and is reverting to its natural state.

The development zones referred to above are at a higher elevation than the remainder of the Pinewood/Hazledene development as well as the properties of Burnieboozle Crescent and Countesswells Crescent. This creates a natural runoff of water at times when the land is waterlogged. We do not believe the Applicant's flood prevention measures are sufficiently robust to prevent an inundation of flood water into the neighbouring properties referred to above.

At present flooding of the homes to the East of the proposed development of 350 dwellings (of which Zones D E F and G form an integral part) has been prevented by virtue of a French drain installed by Aberdeen City Council. According to the Applicant's "Design Statement" there is a list of 'streetscape materials' which essentially must be capable of running off rainwater. However, by virtue of their water resistance, they are likely to add to the flooding of the site during periods of heavy rainfall.

The Applicant's intention, documented in the design statement, to create a varying coverage of hard surfaces is difficult to reconcile with the agricultural system of subsoil, herringbone field drains which the Applicant states, on 'Drawing Nr: ABR\_HAZ\_902', "will be cleaned and reshaped to avoid obstruction and maintain flow". In our view, the excavations needed to build houses and create a network of roads and paths, combined with the overlay of hard surfaces will disrupt the natural springs and constrain the water table so that it is forced to the surface in the curtilages of properties within the site or in its green open spaces. We are not convinced that cleaning field drains, which bear little relationship to the surface coverage of an urban environment, will significantly contribute to solving the ongoing problem of flood prevention in the area referred to as Zones D E F and G. Field drains were meant to prevent the flooding of agricultural land, not an urban landscape.

Although the Applicant has stated that the attenuation ponds will have a fences round their boundaries, we are concerned that those bodies of water will be safety hazards for children at play. We are mindful that this is to be a new residential development, which is likely to be the home to a number of young families and therefore feel compelled to doubt that the creation of attenuation ponds is a safe solution to the problem of flooding on this site.

We question robustness of the Applicant's flood prevention strategy. For example, the Applicant seems to have provided no estimate of the capacities of the North and South Detention Basins. Furthermore, the ability of the 'wetland park' to cope with a rapidly rising water table seems to be speculative. This statement has taken into consideration the unavoidable situation whereby Zones D E F and G form an integral part of the whole development and therefore must be included in our objections which, in summary of the reasons given in the above paragraphs, declare that the entire site known as Pinewood/Hazledene should not, in our view, be developed.

Finally, the upgrading of the core path, together with the provision of connecting pathways could possibly attract unwanted motorbike racers, which would result in adverse changes to the amenities in the area, raising issues of health and safety. It would also be contrary to the current trend of designing out crime when planning 21<sup>st</sup> century housing developments.

Yours sincerely  
William Sell  
Chairperson

# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To	Gavin Evans Planning & Infrastructure	Date	05/08/2013
		Your Ref.	P131055 (ZLF)
		Our Ref.	TR/RB/1/51/2
From	Roads Projects		
Email	<a href="mailto:rbailie@aberdeencity.gov.uk">rbailie@aberdeencity.gov.uk</a>		
Dial	01224 522161		
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. P131055**  
**Hazledene Zone D E F & G, Hazlehead**  
**Application for Matters Specified in condition 12 (siting, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping) relating to A7/2178 Planning Permission in Principle**

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

## 1 Development Proposal

- 1.1 I note that the application is for Matters Specified in condition 12 (siting, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping) relating to A7/2178 Planning Permission in Principle.

## 2 Condition 12

- 2.1 A swept path analysis is to be submitted showing a refuse vehicle accessing all parts of the site.

## 3 Conclusion

- 3.1 Once the above requested data is submitted and approved this condition will be purified.

**Richard Bailie**  
Engineer

Gordon McIntosh  
Corporate Director

# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To	Gavin Evans Planning & Infrastructure	Date	07/11/2013
		Your Ref.	P131055 (ZLF)
		Our Ref.	TR/RB/1/51/2
From	Roads Projects		
Email	<a href="mailto:RBailie@aberdeencity.gov.uk">RBailie@aberdeencity.gov.uk</a>		
Dial	01224 522161		
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. P131055**  
**Pinewood Zone D E F & G, Countesswells Road, Hazlehead**  
**Application for Matters Specified in condition 12 (siting, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping) relating to A7/2178 Planning Permission in Principle**

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

## **1 Development Proposal**

1.1 I note that the application is for Matters Specified in condition 12 (siting, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping) relating to A7/2178 Planning Permission in Principle.

## **2 Condition 12**

2.1 I note that I previously requested swept path analysis be submitted showing a refuse vehicle operating in the proposed development. After discussion the layouts have now been agreed as per drawing No. 915 Rev 3 and this condition has now been purified.

**Richard Bailie**  
Engineer

Gordon McIntosh  
Corporate Director

PI

---

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 26 July 2013 21:40  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 131055

Comment for Planning Application 131055

Name : Michael D Watson

Address : 31 Countesswells Crescent,  
Aberdeen  
AB15 8LN


Comment : Plan zone F does not take into account recommendation in the Mackay Woodland Assessment. This calls for 17m safety zone. Plots 41,42,43,44, 48,49,50 & others are too close to mature beech trees up to 28m in height. New residents will seek to have these trees severely cut back once they have experienced high winds due to falling twigs and branches. One tree from this line fell several years ago with the top in my garden.

Controlled Activity Regulations Water framework directive. Zone G Buckler Burn which flows to pond in James Hutton Institute & the Johnston Gardens. The plan shows plots 15,16 & 17 built over source wetland for this watercourse. No indication of alternative water supply. Is this stream to be killed off by removal of catchment?

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 15 August 2013 14:51  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 131055

Comment for Planning Application 131055

Name : Carly Stewart  
Address : 81 Burnieboozle Crescent  
Aberdeen  
AB15 8NS



Comment : I have already submitted an objection to tree 40 being marked for removal. This is not a separate objection, but additional comments in support of my original objection. After submitting my previous objection (which I did from work) I returned home and looked at the tree. I accept I am no expert but it appears to me to be one of the healthiest ones in the field!

The description in the tree survey of "poor condition" gives no detail at all of what is wrong with the tree eg. that it has a particular disease of the like.


I am suspicious that a neighbour requested the tree be marked for removal as it blocks their sunlight, only for an hour in the early evening. However, the tree is not at the bottom of their garden it is at the bottom of our garden. Its removal will leave our garden significantly exposed, particularly given the proposed footpath will lead to increased foot fall along the bottom of our garden. This is a serious security concern. The blocking of sunlight in the early evening (around 5.30pm) is not a reason to remove a perfectly healthy tree. The tree is of a significant size and its roots will absorb a fair amount of moisture from the ground. Given the proposed development drainage is already a concern; the removal of an otherwise healthy tree will only compound this problem. I presume the council employ tree surgeons or the like and I very strongly think there should be a second opinion before any trees are marked for removal.

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 29 July 2013 22:32  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 131055

Comment for Planning Application 131055

Name : Forbes & Pauline Reid

Address : 27 Countesswells Crescent, Aberdeen, AB15 8LN.



Comment : 1) This is a designated green belt site.

2) No survey appears to have been completed on the wildlife that uses the designated building area.

3) Previous applications included large water basins that now appear to be not required, will this cause flooding issues in future??? Who will be responsible if this occurs?

4) Unlikely brand new primary schools at both Hazlehead & Airyhall will cope with the influx. What plans have the council to ease this congestion?

5) Increased road congestion on a road that is already not fit for purpose.....Countesswells Road heading out from Aberdeen is no more than a country lane and would require upgrading.

Also increased traffic past Airyhall Primary School.

6) Conflict of interest for the council as they were main land owner for the plot.



Robert Vickers

130994



**From:** Eleanor Webster  
**Sent:** 30 July 2013 14:31  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Hazledene and Pinewood Development Site

Ref : Dandara Development Site plan dated May 13

It would appear that the construction site access is via Countesswells Avenue, the access to the other zones is by roundabout from Countesswells Road. Surely Planning will insist that this access road is constructed prior to proceeding with any building development, similar to the works carried out at Portlethen for the Stewart Milne site. This would insure that all construction equipment and materials can access the site without any inconvenience to the existing residents.

Can we assume that Countesswells Road will require to be widened up to the new roundabout. If road widening is planned would this mean compulsory purchase of ground from residential gardens on Countesswells Road?

view of the large number of houses planned for this development it is obvious that once again there is no consideration given to the impact of the traffic increase.

We await your response.

Eleanor and James Webster  
Sent from my iPad

