

Robert Vickers

From: william sell [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 June 2014 19:33
To: Paul Williamson; PI
Subject: First Phase of 124 Houses for Countesswells Development - Application Reference 140730

Dear Mr Williamson,

Application Reference: 140730

Local Authority Reference: 000089879-001

Proposal Description: Residential development comprising 124 units & associated new and upgraded access roads, landscaping & ancillary engineering works

Application type: Detailed Planning Permission

Representation by Craigiebuckler and Seafield Community Council

The community council has been involved in the process of planning this development from the early stages, and agrees in principle with the development. However if this planning application is accepted in its present format, it could set the standards for the subsequent applications of the series. This would be detrimental to the overall 3000 homes plan for the Countesswells Development because, as the initial planning application, it is deficient in the following respects:

- The plan for the development is lacking in character and therefore fails to give a sense of place.
- This development lacks green space. 'A central park' some distance away is not a substitute for the inclusion of green space in the plan.
- It fails to encourage walking by omitting to include a network of paths which would form links to similar paths in adjacent phases of the development.
- The omission of paths in the plan implies that pedestrians must share the road with vehicles. This is not safe.
- The roadways are of insufficient width to provide parking spaces for visitors or delivery vehicles. Consequently the lack of capacity in this respect would result in those roadways being blocked when items of furniture are being delivered to the new homes.
- Similarly, operations such as snow ploughing and Fire Service emergency responses could be impeded or obstructed because the roadways are too narrow to permit the access of wide vehicles.
- The development is the first of a series, and should provide residents with some facilities prior to the amenities which will feature in the larger development. For example, there is nowhere for young people to socialise within this development, and there are no play areas.
- It does not impress as a plan that aspires to go beyond the functionary production of houses. In that sense it is merely utilitarian. Amenities that enhance the quality of life for the first residents of the Countesswells development should be included in the plan.
- Appendices of the traffic assessment are not available, so it is not possible to comment on the document.

We contend that the application should be refused in its present form.

Yours Sincerely,
William Sell
Chairman
Craigiebuckler and Seafield Community Council