

PI

---

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 20 March 2015 15:39  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110

Name : Laura Cameron  
Address : 23 Avenue Gardens  
London  
SW14 8BP

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Dear Sirs,

We write to object to the proposed submission to relocate Aberdeen Riding Club to Nether Anguston.

The large expanse of metal sheeting of a single colour will make the buildings appear visually dominant on the landscape. If approved it would benefit from possible alternative coloured sheeting to break up the structure, or a variety of materials to complement the rural setting.

**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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

PI

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 20 March 2015 12:21  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110

Name : Bruce Thomson  
Address : 6 The Steading  
Upper Anguston  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Although there are many other agricultural buildings in the Anguston area there is not one anywhere near the size or scale of this complex being proposed.

However our major concern is the volume of traffic, people, bikes and horses on the C class road leading from the A93 to the proposed site. In the application there is no mention of the C Class road and intimates that access is from the A93 to the farm track which I believe to be a bit misleading as this suggests that no consideration has been taken for the minor road linking the A93 to the farm track where access to the site will be. This road is presently in poor condition, is twisty and not well maintained.

With the scale of this riding school and with 60 liveries and endless lessons that means an excess of 60 cars every day using this C class road. Many of the liveries will have trailers, 7.5 tonne and HGV lorries to transport their horses to and from competition venues in the area, again they will use this road predominantly in the evenings and at weekends.

We also see on the plan that a new exit from the site appears to be very close to a blind summit on the road, which is alarming.

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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
Sent: 16 March 2015 20:35  
To: PI  
Subject: Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110  
Name : Jennifer Johnston  
Address : Eddieston Smiddy  
Anguston  
Peterculter  
AB14 OPR

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : We would like to object to this application on the grounds that the road leading to the proposed development is not suitable for more traffic than there is at present. It is single track in most places with deep drainage ditches on either side in some parts. There are no suitable passing places for large vehicles such as horse boxes. It is also not suitable for pedestrians (numbers would be likely to increase as the nearest bus stop is on the main road). The road is also not suitable for horses as it is very difficult to ensure that you can leave enough room to pass by safely. If this application is to be approved, it should be on the condition that the road up to Nether Anguston is made suitable for two-way traffic along with a pavement for pedestrians and bridle path for horses. It should also be noted that the only suitable access road to Anguston is from the South as the road from the North (near Cullerlie) is a private road which is in very poor condition. In order to ease congestion if the development is to go ahead, another condition should be to bring the road from the North (Cullerlie) up to the required standard for adoption by Aberdeen & Aberdeenshire Councils and ensure that this adoption takes place.

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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

PI

m: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 17 March 2015 11:26  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110

Name : karen and david hainsworth  
 Address : 3 Hillcrest  
 Baads  
 Peterculter  
 AB14 OPP

Telephone : [REDACTED]  
 Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I would to object to this planning application on because of the impact on the traffic and road network in [REDACTED] area taking into consideration the following points.

The proposed development has parking for over 80 cars plus an overflow carpark and a turning area for horseboxes. This would vastly increase the volume of traffic using the local road network.

1. The road from the main N. Deeside Road to Nether Anguston is narrow, twisty and has poor visibility of oncoming traffic. It is difficult to pass other oncoming vehicles without driving on the grass verge and it is only possible to pass large oncoming vehicles such as tractors /delivery vehicles by pulling into driveways and waiting for them to pass.
2. The road surface is very poor. It has already been extensively patched New potholes appear at regular intervals and the tarmac at the verges is breaking down. The extra traffic especially horseboxes will lead to a more rapid deterioration of the road.
3. The proposed vehicular exit is in an extremely dangerous place. Driving from the north there is a blind crest and the exit appears to be situated just after the crest. If you are exiting the riding school you will not be able to see traffic already on the road approaching from the north.
4. There is no safe walking /cycling path from the main N.Deeside Road The increased volume of traffic would make it more dangerous for all road users.
5. The closest public transport is to the N.Deeside Road. With the unsafe walking route I believe users of the riding school would not utilize this. Does this fit in with the green transport plan?
6. With stabling for around 100 horses there will inevitably be more horses and riders using the local roads. Adding this road usage to the increased no.of vehicles will lead to frustration and potentially dangerous driving.

I believe this planning application should be refused unless there are radical changes to the existing road . This should include straightening the road, widening the road to provide proper single carriage way and construction of a pavement from the N Deeside Road to Nether Anguston. The location of the exit from the site should be relocated

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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and

PI

**From:** Malissa Fraser <malissaclydesdale@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 20 March 2015 15:59  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning application 150110 Formation on Riding School at Nether Anguston

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to you regarding planning application 150110, we have reviewed the planning documents, and wished to bring to your attention our concerns regarding the plans.

Our main concern lies with the increased traffic on an already hazardous road and single access route into the existing community. There is only one reasonably viable road into the existing housing, arable and amenities from the main North Deeside road. The road traffic is already fast and busy from hell-pad, riding, farming machinery, cattery and habitation traffic. The traffic consists of school buses, tractor machinery, 4 x 4, cyclists, walkers and delivery vehicles already. The road itself is poorly maintained and suffers regularly from weather related and heavy farm traffic damage. Access from the North Deeside road coming from the west is hazardous at the best of times. Also a good amount of people walk the road from Lynmore school with families and special learning conditions. There are limited opportunities to have traffic driving on both sides of the road and very few viable passing places that are not dangerous in themselves. Adding to the traffic volume as dramatically as the riding school would, would pose a serious increase in risk to the drivers and users of the road. Please also be aware of the transit route for hydrocarbon pipelines that cross the road. Perhaps also a consideration is the bridge itself and its construction durability.

The condition of this poor quality, single access and single carriageway road surely does not safely support the proposed volume of traffic.

In addition to the above consideration, please also look at the proposed exit point from the riding school. The exit point would be at blind summit of the road, on a single carriageway section which would seriously impact the safety of the road users.

Best Regards,

Malissa & Scott Fraser



PI

**From:** webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
**Sent:** 19 March 2015 16:36  
**To:** PI  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110

Name : Isla wiseman  
 Address : Southview  
 Baads  
 Peterculter  
 Aberdeen  
 AB14 OPP

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

- Comment : In principle I do not object to the location of the riding school but I have grave concerns about the access to the facility. It is my understanding that development should be accessible by public transport within a 400m radius. This is not the case here. The existing road is narrow without passing places and does not have a white line painted on it. There will be a huge increase in traffic if the proposal goes ahead. I have a good understanding of how a riding school operates and not only will there be people rushing to get to time sensitive riding lessons but many people who own their own horses bring the horses in horse boxes and floats to have tuition. Many young people attend these schools for long periods in the day and even if they do take public transport to North Deeside Road they will then have to walk up and down the road which is narrow and has no pavement. It was our understanding that there was an access road to be built directly from North Deeside road. If this were the case I would not object. I myself had a head on collision with a speeding driver on the road in question. It is widely known in the area that the stretch of road in question is the most dangerous part and the part most prone to icing in winter. I myself encourage my family to cycle to the village which I admit I am already nervous about doing. I will definitely not be allowing them to do this if the plan goes ahead. Rather than discouraging use of cars it will force all the users of the facility and all the residents of the area to use their cars and I know that this is not in line with local policy. Other equestrian facilities have been applied for and turned down in the past due to accessibility issues. These applications were on a much smaller scale than the proposed facility. I am incredulous that the largest riding facility in Grampian would be located on such a narrow road. Safety of people particularly children is paramount. A new access road would solve
- All the issues stated above.

**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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk  
Sent: 10 March 2015 14:36  
To: PI  
Subject: Planning Comment for 150110

Comment for Planning Application 150110  
Name : Dr and Mrs HR Millar  
Address : Failte  
Mid Anguston  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen  
AB14 OPP

Telephone :  
Email : [REDACTED]

type :  
Comment : Failte  
Mid Anguston  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen  
AB14 OPP

10th March 2014 Planning and Sustainable Development Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4 Marischal College Broad Street Aberdeen  
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir or Madam,

Application Reference 150110  
Local Authority Reference 000109584-001  
Proposed Riding School at Nether Anguston

We are writing as local residents to comment on the above proposal. It is understandable for the reasons set out in the application why Aberdeen Riding Club is coming forward with this proposal. However, it should be acknowledged that this is a very large development of big buildings in a rural, green belt setting, which will generate a significant level of activity, noise, traffic and disruption in a very quiet area of countryside.

Disturbance of rural setting

Despite what is suggested in the application these large buildings and the associated activity will have a significant effect on the landscape. If the application is approved the commitment to set the buildings into the lower part of the field by grading the land should be obligatory. Also, some tree planting to the north west of the site sufficient to screen the buildings could improve the intrusion on the open view from our houses in Mid Anguston. There will be noise and light pollution which should be minimized, for example by insisting radios are not played outdoors and creating landscaping to limit noise travel.

The Road

This is one of the most serious limitations to the proposed development. The road coming from the North Deeside Road into the area has been a cause of concern to residents for many years. New steading developments and the increase of internet shopping delivery vans have increased the traffic on a road where room for 2 vehicles to pass is limited and compromised by poor maintenance, creating broken verges and potholes. We have personal experience of incidents due to traffic going too fast especially round blind corners of which there are several between the main road and the proposed development e.g I was once forced into a ditch to avoid a collision and my

daughter's car was hit head on by another vehicle coming out of a blind corner. The proposal suggests some will cycle or walk from the main road but there is no pavement and this will be at some risk to the pedestrians if current traffic behavior is anything to go by. Also, the riding school will generate its own vehicular traffic, including large horse lorries and trailers, which will add to the hazards. In addition it looks as if the exit directly onto the road is close to a blind summit.

#### Hacking Out

It is not clear what expectation there is for hacking out. There are no local bridleways suitable for heavy use and any riding out would need to be on the above mentioned hazardous road. The addition of horses on this road as a regular feature will add to the risk of serious accidents.

#### Staff Accommodation

We could not find reference to whether there will be resident staff, which might be considered relevant for a large stabling of 60 horses. If it were decided to have resident staff it would be unacceptable to add unsightly caravans to the site as happens at some stables.

#### Conclusion

While we appreciate the good work done by Aberdeen Riding School over the years and their need to find a new base we are objecting to this proposal. We recommend that there should be a site visit so that there can be a full appreciation of the likely impact this will have on a quiet rural area and to understand how inadequate the road will be for accessing this development. The road badly requires upgrading and if not properly rebuilt to enable two vehicles to pass on tarmac throughout its length there should be consideration of installing a walking path, passing places and a speed limit.

Yours sincerely,

Dr & Mrs H R Millar

**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 email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email 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 email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 150110		
RECEIVED 11 MAR 2015		
Nor	Sou ✓	MAP
Case Officer Initials: NIL		
Date Acknowledged: 12/03/2015.		



1 Quarryhill  
Anguston  
PETERCULTER  
AB14 0PP



16 March 2015

Local Development Planning Team  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Ground Floor North  
Marishal College  
Broad Street  
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Re Planning Application No 150110**  
**Formation of a Riding School at Nether Anguston Farm**

I hereby register my objection to the above proposal.

To begin I refer you to Issue 49 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (referring to a previous application) which states unsuitability due to

- 1 the width of the existing minor country road
- 2 its poor condition;
- 3 accessibility issues.
- 4 is unrelated to the existing settlement.

It is my understanding that the proposed Riding School will house a high number of horses.

These animals would require daily feeding, grooming etc. Would this be handled by their owners? That being the case, how many extra vehicles would require to use this back road?

If they wish to ride and exercise their animals would they use this same small back road?

This gives rise to have two major concerns, that of Road Safety and secondly of Health.

Firstly in regard to road safety, I quote my comments of 8 March 2014 on the Mid Anguston Greenfield Housing Proposal.

"As someone who has lived here for 25 years, I have seen an increase in the traffic due to some steading conversions, a cattery and a helipad. There are more delivery vans and large lorries on this narrow road. Never having been built for the amount of traffic it now sustains, the one mile long road between Mid Anguston and the North Deeside Road is in poor condition. It has no road markings and no lighting. The verges are poorly kept and falling away in places. Potholes are a real concern. The patching, when done, is of the temporary sort, due to understandable budget constraints and does not last. The road is narrow and can just take passing cars and larger vehicles only with care.

I am a top graded Driving Instructor, in business for some 30 years. It is my professional opinion that we have been very fortunate not to have had a major accident on this narrow, twisted stretch of road. I would ask, please, that this comment be placed on record.

While people are mostly driving within the speed limit, not all know the road, nor are they taking into consideration the road conditions. There are regular 'near misses'. These do not always occur at peak times. On the quieter times, people can be less alert on a quiet country road and forgetful that another car may be coming in the opposite direction. I have been put off the road, one next door neighbour has been forced into a ditch and the other, involved in an accident with a motor cyclist. If required I am sure that the Police would be able to verify this statement. For these reasons we no longer walk along the road for recreation."

Add to the above lorry horse boxes and trailers, to say nothing of horses being ridden on this road.

Secondly the issue of Health.

Periodically over last year there have been 7 horses in the field adjoining our back garden. During the summer on several warm, still days there were fly 'hatches' which we believe emanated from the horse manure, lasting for almost 24 hours. They were particularly dense and literally covered washing for our two white dogs. We had to come indoors and close all the windows and doors. Access to the garden was impossible. We contacted Environmental Health Dept on the first occasion who told us they could do nothing as it was not an indoor infestation.

If this Riding School proposal was granted and the increase in animals resulted in an increase of the above problem, who would be responsible for sorting it out and what would be done to sort it out?

There is also the issue of the prevailing wind blowing noxious odours in our direction.

I strongly object to the Muck Heap being placed on the side of the field nearest to our houses.

Who will be responsible for lifting the manure which will be deposited on the roads if the horses are exercised outside the grounds? Who will enforce it?

In conclusion this type of business should not be allowed near human habitation.

Apart from the above and that this area is designated Green Belt, the tranquillity of this rural setting will be spoilt and the quality of life of the existing residents diminished.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Terence N Fullerton.

Terence N Fullerton

Braehead  
Nether Anguston  
Peterculter  
Aberdeen  
AB14 0PN

19 March 2015

**FAO: Nicholas Lawrence**  
Case Officer  
Planning and Sustainable Development  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen  
AB10 1AB

Dear Sirs,

**Planning Application No: 150110**  
**Aberdeen Riding Club ("ARC")**  
**Formation of Riding School with Associated Building, Car Parking and Landscaping at Nether Anguston, Peterculter**

I refer to the above planning application for which I have examined the plans and know the site and area very well. I have serious concerns over the viability, suitability and size of the proposals contained within the application. I live very close to the site and wish to put forward my strong objections to the application on various grounds.

**1. The Aberdeen Local Development Plan:**

The Aberdeen Local Development Plan ("ALDP") provides a land use framework within which future development is to adhere. It sets out the policies that Aberdeen City Council will be promoting, and the limits on same.

- a) Section "Policy RT2 – Out of Centre Proposals" of the ALDP, a copy of which is enclosed herewith for ease of reference, states that:

*"Retail, commercial, leisure and other development appropriate to town centres, when proposed on a site that is out-of-centre, will be refused planning permission if it does not satisfy all of the following requirements:*

...

*4. The proposed development would be easily and safely accessibly by a choice of means of transport using a network of walking, cycling and public transport routes which link with the catchment population. In particular, the proposed development would be easily accessibly by regular, frequent and convenient public transport services and would not be dependent solely on access by private car."*

In this instance, the proposed development is over 1600 metres from the main road (one mile exactly) and there is no public transport network. This is clearly in contravention of the ALDP.

- b) More generally, the ALDP puts a strong emphasis on the importance of a good infrastructure with good transport connections being essential for future and existing communities. This infrastructure is not present in the area. In the absence of such, access to the proposed development would be dependent solely on private vehicles.

## 2. Green Belt

The area in which the development is proposed is part of the Green Belt round Aberdeen which was introduced to: prevent coalescence between Aberdeen and suburbs along lower Deeside; to encourage redevelopment of brownfield sites; to help prevent inappropriate development in the countryside; and, to protect areas of countryside.

- a) "Area G Deeside" of the Aberdeen Green Belt Review, a copy of which is enclosed herewith for ease of reference, expressly mentions Anguston in the paragraph headed '**Areas considered unsuitable for development**':

*"Land around Anguston, North Lasts and Beanshill is relatively remote and has poor accessibility.....*

*...All other sites on Deeside are considered undesirable for a number of reasons, most commonly impacts on the landscape setting and Dee valley, loss of biodiversity, trees and woodlands, poor accessibility and remoteness."*

This specifically designates Anguston as an area which is poorly equipped to accommodate a development of the size that is envisaged by the proposals in the planning application.

- b) In addition, in the ALDP, at Point NE2 (a copy of which is enclosed for ease of reference), it is stated that:

*"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."*

A development of this size and scale, and which would have such an impact on local infrastructure, is not one which is compatible with an agricultural or natural setting.

The following exceptions to this general ban on development in Green Belt areas apply to proposals for development associated with *existing activities* in the Green Belt.

*"The following exceptions apply to this policy:*

1. *The proposals for development associated with existing activities in the green belt will be permitted but only if all of the following criteria are met:*
  - (a) *The development is within the boundary of existing activity.*
  - (b) *The development is **small-scale**.*
  - (c) *The intensity of activity is **not significantly increased**.*
  - (d) *Any proposed built construction is **ancillary** to what exists"*

The proposed development is not small-scale, will significantly increase the intensity of activity and is not ancillary to what already exists.

As the proposed development is not associated with an *existing activity*, it would follow that the above exceptions are therefore even more relevant in this instance.

Clearly, the proposed development is in contravention of the ALDP.

- c) Further, the application for the deletion of the occupancy condition for Erinvale Cattery was refused (Application: 131114-01) on the basis that it was:

*'... contrary to Scottish Planning Policy and Policy NE2 (Green Belt) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, which seek to protect the integrity of Green Belts and, in particular, seek to avoid the granting of individual planning permissions to prevent the cumulative erosion of a green belt. .... The removal of this condition would undermine the policies which seek to protect the integrity of the Green Belt which seeks to safeguard against unsustainable development and suburbanisation of the area.'*

This example of strict enforcement of Green Belt policy must undoubtedly also be applied to the proposals contained within the application.



### 3. Roads, Road Safety and Transport Links

- a) Access to the site is proposed to be from the North Deeside Road (A93) via one mile of very narrow road ("the access road") which is in poor condition with no markings, pavements or lighting. There are several blind bends and, in particular, one badly cambered bend where there have been accidents and very many near misses.
- b) The fact that the planning application proposes space for 80 car parking spaces, plus overflow, gives some indication of the projected traffic flow, about which there is a lack of meaningful comment in the application save for within the site itself.
- c) In places on the access road, there is insufficient room for two vehicles to pass safely, especially those which would be used to transport horses and those used to service the development.
- d) Access to and from the A93 along the access road is via a steep hill which, in winter, can be very dangerous to negotiate due to icy conditions and which when covered with snow is often blocked by stuck vehicles. The access road itself, over the years, has frequently been impassable in winter to normal vehicles.
- e) The turning into the access road from the west from the A93 is very difficult to achieve safely due to its acute angle in relation to the A93.
- f) Traffic has already increased substantially over the years due to the conversion of farm steadings to form living accommodation, and the establishment of two small businesses in the area: Erinvale Cattery and HJS Helicopters. The current infrastructure is not able to support a further increase in traffic.
- g) The access road is often used by pedestrians as there is no public transport. Cyclists, horse riders and walkers from Linn Moor School also regularly use this road.
- h) The proposed point of access to and from the site itself onto the Anguston Road is at a hill with a blind crest.
- i) Road widening would destroy ancient field boundaries in this historic area which was part of the Drum Castle Estate.

### 4. Amenity of the Area

- a) The proposal would demonstrably harm the amenity enjoyed by local residents, particularly with regard to valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment. The Human Rights Act, Protocol 1, Article 1 specifically identifies that a person has a substantive right to the peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes their home and other land. Additionally, Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. In the case of *Britton -v- SOS*, the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings.
- b) Nether Anguston Farm is a Category B Listed Building whose surroundings would be adversely affected by the presence of this development. A very unique feature of this property is its avenue of trees which can be seen from the North Deeside Road, the view of which would be ruined by the presence of extensive modern buildings. One has only to look at the Milltimber farm livery stables from the South Deeside Road to see how this dominates the landscape.
- c) The photographs of farm buildings attached to the Planning application give a misleading picture of Anguston surroundings: Most of these buildings are not visible as they are not near public roads and are not obvious from the minor roads. One of the buildings pictured is not even located at the Anguston Farm, but at Jackieshillock.

- d) The introduction of all the equine related equipment, eg, shelters, trailers, horse boxes, sheds, jumps etc will result in erosion of the openness and visual amenity of this area.

#### 5. Noise Pollution

There will be a significant increase in noise levels associated with this influx of people, horses and traffic into this quiet area. Noise will be generated from the use of the development itself, from vehicles used by those employed by ARC, by the vehicles used to transport the horses, by the vehicles required to service the development and by the vehicles required to transport those who wish to use this recreational facility. Background noise levels here are very low and sometimes, to all intents and purposes, non-existent. This will be irrevocably lost if the application is approved.

#### 6. Light Pollution

Currently, there are very low levels of light pollution in the area, despite the conversion of several farm buildings to residential use and the intermittent searchlights from the Tillyoch development. The outdoor arena with its floodlighting would be a very unwelcome source of light pollution in the area.

#### 7. Disturbance to Wildlife

A wide variety of wildlife can be seen locally, including badgers, deer, foxes, bats, herons, oystercatchers, skylarks, yellowhammers, birds of prey, swallows, swifts etc, and it is inevitable that they will be disturbed by the intrusion into their habitat of such a large development.

#### 8. Conclusion

In summary, I object strongly to the application on the following grounds:-

1. It is in contravention of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan.
2. It is in contravention of stated Green Belt Policy.
3. The development will adversely affect highway safety.
4. It will have an adverse effect on the amenity of residential properties in the Anguston area and impact negatively on the character of the area.
5. There will be an unacceptable increase in noise levels from the development.
6. There will be an unacceptable increase in levels of light pollution from the development.
7. Wildlife habitats will be disturbed, by the very nature of the size of this development and the noise generated by its use.

I should be grateful if the Council would take my objections into consideration when making a decision about the application, and hope that the ARC will be encouraged to renew their efforts to seek an alternative location with safer access, directly onto a main road, and where there would not be such a negative impact on its surroundings.

I would be very happy to meet with any member of the Planning Committee to illustrate these objections if required.

Yours faithfully

Isobel Gordon

Encs

In all cases, proposals shall not detract significantly from the vitality or viability of any first, second, third or fourth tier retail location listed in the Supplementary Guidance: Hierarchy of Retail Centres, and shall accord with all other relevant policies of the Local Development Plan, including those relating to design, access and amenity. A Retail Impact Assessment may be required.

This policy applies to proposals for new development and to proposals to extend existing development.

In significant new development areas that are more than 800m walking distance from shopping facilities, permission may be granted for the establishment of a new neighbourhood centre. Developers may be required to reserve land for this purpose.

Retail Impact Assessments should be undertaken where a retail or leisure development over 2,500sqm gross floorspace outwith a defined regional or town centre is proposed which is not in accordance with the development plan.

A restriction may be imposed on the amount of comparison goods floorspace allowed within convenience shopping developments outside the city centre or other town centres. Retail Parks are appropriate for large bulky comparison goods if city centre/town centre sites are not available and the site is easily accessible by public transport.

#### **Policy RT2 - Out of Centre Proposals**

Retail, commercial, leisure and other development appropriate to town centres, when proposed on a site that is out-of-centre, will be refused planning permission if it does not satisfy all of the following requirements:

1. No other suitable site in a location that is acceptable in terms of policy RT1 is available or is likely to become available in a reasonable time.
2. There will be no significant adverse effect on the vitality or viability of any retail location listed in Supplementary Guidance: Hierarchy of Retail Centres.
3. There is, in qualitative or quantitative terms, a proven deficiency in provision of the kind of development that is proposed.
4. The proposed development would be easily and safely accessible by a choice of means of transport using a network of walking, cycle and public transport routes which link with the catchment population. In particular, the proposed development would be easily accessible by regular, frequent and convenient public transport services and would not be dependent solely on access by private car.
5. The proposed development would have no significantly adverse effect on travel patterns and air pollution.

## Area G Deeside

This large area covers most of the Lower Deeside ward including the River Dee valley, land around Anguston, Beanshill and Foggieton as well as the settlements of Peterculter, Milltimber, Bielside and Cults and the Pitfodells area. Its character is diverse and includes open farmland around Anguston and North Lasts. Land to the north and between the settlements includes extensive woodland and tree cover. The Dee valley is an important landscape feature and wildlife and recreation corridor (including two golf courses and the Deeside Line) and parts are subject to flooding. There are numerous wildlife sites along the Dee valley and along the Culter Burn, to the north east of Peterculter and at Foggieton, with other sites and woodlands scattered throughout the area. Pitfodells is a Conservation Area. Pipelines run to the west of Peterculter.

### Areas considered unsuitable for development

Areas not assessed include parts of the River Dee valley floor which has landscape, biodiversity and flooding constraints. The River Dee is a Special Area of Conservation – the only designation of international importance in Aberdeen. Land around Anguston, North Lasts and Beanshill is relatively remote and has poor accessibility. Land north and west of Bielside is heavily wooded and contributes towards biodiversity. Land around Hillhead near to Craigton Road is likely to have similar constraints to other Development Options in that area.

The individual settlements have a separate identity and it is important to maintain effective buffer zones between them to prevent their coalescence. There is however, scope for development at Oldfold which could be accommodated whilst maintaining the separate identity of Bielside and Milltimber. All the settlements are well contained by the 90 to 95m contour on the northern side of the Dee valley. 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. There are some smaller infill opportunities at Craigton Road, to the west of Milltimber and south of Peterculter and an extension to Garthdee at Garthdee Farm.

All other sites on Deeside are considered undesirable for a number of reasons, most commonly impacts on the landscape setting and Dee valley, loss of biodiversity, trees and woodlands, poor accessibility and remoteness.

### Preferred Options

The most significant development option on Deeside is at Oldfold where there are very few physical, topographical or natural constraints. Although development would be seen from the North Deeside Road, most of it would be hidden behind Oldfold Farm. Coalescence is often an issue along the Deeside communities, but in this instance, the intervening topography and woodland would ensure that neither visual or physical coalescence would occur between Milltimber and Bielside. The trees along Murtle Den Road and in the large gardens of properties there provide an attractive green backdrop to Oldfold which protects its setting. Woodland to the north and the lochan to the west provides clear boundaries for the development and prevents it encroaching higher ground.

### **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.

The following exceptions apply to this policy:

1. Proposals for development associated with existing activities in the green belt will be permitted but only if all of the following criteria are met:
  - a) the development is within the boundary of the existing activity.
  - b) the development is small-scale.
  - c) the intensity of activity is not significantly increased.
  - d) any proposed built construction is ancillary to what exists.
2. Essential infrastructure, such as electronic communications infrastructure and electricity grid connections, transport proposals identified in the Local Development Plan, such as the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route, as well as roads planned through the masterplanning of new housing and employment allocations, which cannot be accommodated other than in the green belt.
3. Buildings in the green belt which have a historic or architectural interest or traditional character that contributes to the landscape setting of the city will be permitted to undergo a change of use to private residential use or to a use which makes a worthwhile contribution to the amenity of the green belt, providing it has been demonstrated that the building is no longer suitable for the purpose for which it was originally designed. (See Supplementary Guidance on The Conversion of Steadings and other Non-residential Vernacular Buildings in the Countryside).
4. Proposals for extensions of existing buildings as part of a conversion or rehabilitation scheme will be permitted in the green belt provided:
  - a) the original building remains visually dominant;
  - b) the design of the extension is sympathetic to the original building in terms of massing, detailing and materials; and
  - c) the siting of the extension relates well to the setting of the original building.

### **Urban Green Space**

3.67 Government policy states that open space should only be used for other purposes under exceptional circumstances. The Local Development Plan reflects that advice and sets out details on the exceptions which may apply in Aberdeen.

3.68 We completed our first full Open Space Audit in 2010 and the results of this are being used to prepare an Open Space Strategy, which will provide a strategic