

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To: [PI](#)
Subject: Planning Comment for 160571
Date: 02 June 2016 21:08:30

Comment for Planning Application 160571

Name : Tracey Durham
Address : North Linn Farmhouse
Peterculter
AB14 OPD

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I wish to lodge an Objection to the above Application.

1. The Proposal is not 'close to the existing farm track' as stated in the application. It is accessed from the 'purpose built' road (owned by myself and Mr Christopher Parker) that leads to the properties at North Linn. Owners of said field, are only entitled to limited access along this road (as stated in our deeds, available, if need be, for your perusal). There is, however, a farm track at the other end of the Proposer's field, with a gated entrance, which, very peculiarly, has been omitted from Architect's submitted plans?? This has always (according to previous plans/drawings over the years) been the one and only entrance to the field and not the gate that the Proposer installed last year, in preparation of these applications.
2. The proposed site is not 'bound by agricultural land on all sides' as stated in the Application. On one side is the garden for North Linn Cottage, which lies to the front of the property and on another is No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 Steadings and Ronene Cottage, all of which are situated a lot closer to the proposed site than allowed (The Code of Good Practice for the Prevention of Environmental Pollution from Agricultural Activity, Scottish Executive 2005, which gives a minimum distance of 400m between new livestock housing and housing) meaning, really, that nowhere in that field is out with 400 metres, thus deeming it unsuitable for Agricultural livestock buildings.
3. The size of the proposed building seems very extreme to the ratio of land. There would be hardly any ground left that would need large farm equipment for its upkeep. There is no detail of the area of hard standing. Once the hard standing is in, it would reduce the livestock grazing area, casting doubt on the true purpose for the building.
4. No details are given of where the car parking spaces will be.
5. The amenities and size of the proposed building seems to be very extensive in regard to the proposed use.
6. With Culter Burn being so near to proposed site I would expect extensive research to have been carried out, regarding any environmental worries. SEPA have not been consulted over the application.
7. The proposal is not in keeping with the Green Space Network because it is right beside and visible from Culter Burn.
8. Utilities for the proposed site are stated in the Application as being 'close to hand'. If 'close to hand' means having to dig through people's property? As the Proposer will be aware, there is no communal lighting only lighting/electricity at each property.
9. 'Minimal works' is stated in the Proposal. It might well seem as if it would be 'minimal works' if it was on a 'farm track' as stated in the Application but it is NOT a farm track. It is a road. A road that leads 14 people (all with vehicles) back and forth from home to work each day and night. This would most definitely cause disruption and a great deal of inconvenience as the road is single lane. Obviously the Proposer realises the narrowness of the road, continually referring to it as a 'farm track'.
10. From an environmental point North Linn area is very open to the elements (very little trees, no high buildings or fences etc.) thus causing worry regarding odours and noises being 'carried' due to the close proximity to the properties.
11. No Environmental Health report has been submitted for housing livestock within 200m of residential properties.
12. No Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out for siting the building so close to Culter Burn.
13. No Drainage Impact Assessment has been carried out for siting the building so close to Culter Burn. There is no design for the livestock slurry drainage, and the ground is not suitable for soakaway. It looks like raw effluent from livestock will flow directly into the Culter Burn which is part of the River Dee system.

14. I would also like to put on record that we have had previous problems regarding these two fields owned by, now, Mr Lee Elrick, but which last year was registered to Mr James Elrick. In 2015 the road was dug up and also land belonging to me. When I approached the contractors hired by Mr Elrick I was met with abusive language, aggressive behaviour and laughter stating 'they could do what they liked and no-one could stop them'. The Police were involved and work came to a halt but then they returned after dark and carried on. I continually tried to show them the title deeds clearly showing the land they should be working on but was ignored. They then proceeded to do the same at the adjacent field (relating to this Application) thus creating two new gated driveways, one into each field. I did not know why this was done as fields have basically been abandoned since. The map accompanying the Application clearly shows that they, indeed did know that the land they were digging up does not belong to them. I realise that personal opinion and views are not reason alone for objection but added to the points detailed above, think it merits Planning Department having the full story.

15. Going by what I have seen myself and the neighbours that have been here a lot longer informing me, that on at least three occasions they have been threatened by a Travellers Site being put on these fields, I can understand their concern. I am very sceptical about the usage of this Agricultural Building and feel it's a means to another use and not the one stated in the Proposer's Application. Does he have an Agricultural background? Is there evidence of past responsibility for livestock? There has never been any visible agricultural activity undertaken on the land from what I can see. The applicant is in the car business. The only other activity seen has been the exercising of dogs and I understand there is a dog breeding business in the family.

16. In my opinion, this Application is not in keeping with the surrounding area and would be detrimental to wildlife and residents alike. I feel that if this Application was to be allowed, it would only be a matter of time before the same was attempted in the adjacent field. There are Red Kites, Badger sets, roe deer, and the fish (salmon and sea trout) and mammals that live in Culter Burn all within the area. The natural heritage will not be protected or advanced by this development.

17. The applicant is not in keeping with Green Belt Policy. There has never been any building on the site so this is not an additional, this would be a completely new development.

I appreciate your consideration of my Objection to this Application and am hopeful that Aberdeen City Council Planning will investigate my concerns.

I would be most grateful and happy to assist in any way, should there be a site visit.

Yours faithfully,

Ms. Tracey Durham

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.