

PI

From: william sell [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2015 10:16
To: PI; Jennifer Chalmers
Subject: Planning Application No: P151056 Applicant: Stewart Milne Homes Limited
Attachments: Planning application2.pdf

Dear Ms Chalmers,

We submit the attached representation from our Community Council in respect of the above referenced planning application.

Yours sincerely,
William Sell,
Chair,
Craigiebuckler and Seafield Community Council.

CRAIGIEBUCKLER AND SEAFIELD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Ms Jennifer Chalmers
Planning Officer
Development Management
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Marishchal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Email: [REDACTED]

27 July 2015

Dear Ms Chalmers,

Planning Application Number: P151056 Applicant: Stewart Milne Homes Ltd

Site Location: Keppleston Mansion, Viewfield Road, Aberdeen

Proposal: Change of use and part demolition of mansion house with alterations and extension to form four apartments and erection of new building consisting seven apartments with associated car parking and landscaping.

The challenge for developers who have to consolidate listed buildings in their development projects is one of successfully combining the protected historical architectural features of existing buildings with 21st century minimalist development designs which, conversely, are governed by contemporary building regulations.

Keppleston Mansion, in common with a number of other listed buildings in Aberdeen, has stood disused whilst solutions for its future have been debated. In the interim period, like some of those other historically significant buildings, it has been destroyed by local youths. Therefore we believe that it is in the public interest that the sympathetic development of this brownfield site begins as soon as possible.

However, we object to the application proceeding without a detailed structural engineer's report being commissioned by Aberdeen City Council, as the adjudicating authority, on the structural integrity of the mansion and the eighteenth century farm house. We contend, without prejudice, that the Council should have its own report on the feasibility of consolidating the remaining historical structures in the planned development for comparison with Page 8, Section 4, of the application, "The Fire Damage and its Affects".

We refer to the following paragraphs:-

4.2, lines 4 to 7:- "Whilst the external walls remain standing, no internal construction floor or roof in this area remain intact. It is Fairhursts' assertion that this part of the building is structurally unsafe and therefore should be demolished".

29 JUL 2015

4.3 :- “The single storey wing to the north of the 2 storey part has also been very badly damaged. Fairhursts’ view is that the bulk of this should be demolished, with a small element to the very end of the wing theoretically able to be salvaged. However retaining it would leave a small isolated section of the building of dubious structural integrity. Consequently the view is to demolish the mansion house in its entirety”.

Although we have no access to the site, we are of the opinion that the external walls, built as load bearing structures, are unlikely to have been strengthened by the roof and internal floor. Therefore we question what functions the roof and internal floor had in strengthening the external walls and ask why, by reason of their destruction by fire, the load bearing walls have become unviable structures? The planning authority should ask this question and veto this application until it is satisfied with the answer.

We object to the view, which is ‘to demolish the mansion house in its entirety’.

Furthermore we object to this planning application because, in its present form, it provides no information about the routes of the service runs for drainage, gas, electricity, water supply, etc.

Although there are a number of attractive mature broad leaf trees on or adjacent to the site, the Applicant has not provided a tree survey.

We consider that both of the aforementioned omissions are significant because of the co-relation between the excavations for the service runs and the risk of damage to the tree roots.



The trees on the site of this proposed development are magnificent. Therefore we believe that this application should not be allowed until the Applicant has provided detailed plans for the service runs and any substation to be built on site, to enable the planning authority to be satisfied that carrying out the proposal will have no direct adverse affect upon the trees.



We have compared the photograph on the previous page (which shows the dominance of the trees) with the above drawings from the plan (particularly the drawing at the top of this page) and are convinced that the trees will have to be cut back or removed to allow the proposed development to progress to its planned extent.

We note that the trees are 'faded out' in the above drawings and consequently interpret this as an indication that they will be removed or substantially cut back. It is our submission that this application should not be allowed until the applicant has modified the plan to avoid any harmful effect on the trees.

The Applicant has produced a plan which communicates the intention to harmonise the historical architecture of the 18th century farmhouse with the contemporary design of its proposed extension. Although we believe that this proposed restorative consolidation will secure the future of the farmhouse, it is also our contention that planning permission should not be granted until the Applicant modifies the development plan to accommodate resolutions to the objections which we have detailed in this representation.

Yours sincerely,

William Sell,

Chair