

15 Baillieswells Road  
Bielside  
Aberdeen AB15 9BB

28<sup>th</sup> May 2016

Aberdeen City Council  
Planning & Infrastructure  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
ABERDEEN

Dear Sirs,

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION No. 160583 (11 BAILLIESWELLS ROAD)**

I wish to object to the above planning application and request that it be rejected by the Planning and Infrastructure Department. I have studied the proposals with care and object on several grounds.

The Design Statement misrepresents the site and its environment. The previously existing house at No.11 was not 'unoccupied for a number of years'. The house was in good condition and was occupied up until its purchase by the developer in 2009. It was demolished soon after purchase.

The house and garden made a positive impact on the amenity of the neighbourhood. The garden has been allowed to become unsightly since the developer purchased No.11 and demolished the house in presumption of gaining planning permission.

Inappropriate Scale and Massing

The scale and massing of the development is out of proportion with the surrounding neighbourhood. All of the properties leading up to the proposed development are well spaced and are of cottage or bungalow style houses that are significantly smaller. There is no accurate illustration provided of the relationship between the proposed building and the adjoining properties. The Streetscape Elevation shows the proposed house occupying the southerly part of the No.11 plot and if a second house is subsequently constructed adjacent to it the houses would be closely packed and the building line of the street would be disrupted by the development. The Site Plan suggests that over 40% of the southern half of the plot shown would be occupied by the building, driveway and paths.

Road Safety Concerns

The proposed house has a small garage suitable for only small cars. A family car, e.g. a 4.9m Ford Mondeo, would not fit. The turning area has been greatly reduced when compared with the turning area of the house that occupied the site previously. The car depicted on the Site Plan is misleading since according to the 1:250 scale it is very small at below 3.9m. A typical owner of a house of this size would have at least one family sized car which would dominate the parking area depicted. With a car parked on the driveway there is inadequate turning area and cars would have to reverse out onto the main road at a dangerous junction. This is hazardous given the speed and density of traffic on the road and the use of the pavement at this junction on school days by children crossing to/from Cults Primary School and Cults Academy. If a second house were to be built on the plot it would either have to share this driveway or face directly the junction with Cairnlee Terrace which would be hazardous.

Loss of Urban Green Space

The site was occupied previously by a modest bungalow. Mature trees occupied the garden and it was significant as urban green space. The trees in particular had a positive impact on the neighbourhood. It is regrettable that they were felled seemingly in presumption of gaining planning

consent to redevelop the plot. The Tree Report mistakenly refers to the trees at No.11 as having been felled 'for safety reasons'. Damage was caused to neighbouring trees which then had to be felled for safety reasons.

The loss of the trees has significantly adversely affected the landscape character in the neighbourhood. Redevelopment of no.11 must provide for significant re-planting to restore the site to its former environmental amenity. To propose planting only two trees and a screen of evergreens at the rear boundary is wholly inadequate.

Bielside is characterised by its trees which are a particularly important feature of the neighbourhood and provide a sense of wellbeing and amenity for residents and a haven for wildlife. The development as proposed would contravene the City Council's guidance on trees and woodlands. There is quite rightly a presumption against all development that will result in the loss of or damage to established trees that contribute significantly landscape character or local amenity.

For the above reasons, I respectfully ask the Planning and Infrastructure Department to reject this planning application. In my opinion the site is suitable for redevelopment by a single house sited in a re-planted garden.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.