

From: Culter PLO
Sent: Tue, 31 Jan 2017 17:37:58 +0000
To: Pl;Gavin Evans;Roy Brown
Cc: Aileen Malone;M.Tauqeer Malik;Marie Boulton;Andrew Horgan;Barry Wink;Catherine Lacy;Anne Russell;David Wakefield;Lavina Massie;Ann Wakefield;Julia Crighton;Val Muir;Doug MacGregor;Nicola Winter
Subject: 161769 384 North Deeside Road - representation from Culter Community Council

Culter Community Council has been approached by numerous members of the community, who uniformly objected to the original proposal submitted in December 2016 on grounds of its size, style, and location on the site with consequent impact on trees and screening and hence amenity of the area.

Culter Community Council (CCC) believes that the best outcome is a scheme revised such that it delivers what the applicant is looking for and is acceptable to the neighbours. To this end, CCC held a meeting with the applicant to establish whether the applicant would amend the proposal before determination by the Planning Authority. Following this meeting the applicant submitted a revised scheme on 26 January 2017.

The Planning Authority has decided (email from Gavin Evans dated 30 January 2017) that the revised proposal is not sufficiently different to justify extending the planning process, and therefore we are obliged to make a representation at this time. This means that we have not had the opportunity to consult with our community and establish whether the revised scheme is now broadly acceptable to the neighbours as well as to the applicant, nor to explore whether there are other changes which might make the scheme satisfactory to all parties.

Culter Community Council would have preferred to reserve its position, but given the absence of any further time period for consultation, CCC must reflect the majority view of the community at the time of making this representation.

Culter Community Council therefore objects to the original proposal, on the grounds that the proposal would not maintain the identity, the ambience, and the sense of place of this part of Culter, as set out in Scottish Government's 2013 policy statement "Creating Places", and specifically:

- The proposal created consistent and significant disquiet amongst numerous neighbours, as reflected in the number of formal objections lodged.
- The style of the proposed building would be out of keeping in the middle of a residential area of predominantly traditional dwellings (however much it would not raise an eyebrow in a retail park or industrial estate) and hence would not comply with Policy D1 Quality Placemaking by Design or with Policy H1 Residential Areas.
- The proposed location would preclude the retention of the limited number of mature trees along the western boundary, and also would provide minimal space for new planting. Any replacement planting which proved to be possible in such a narrow strip between the new building and the path inside the boundary would take 20 years to

provide any effective screening, let alone start to break the roof-line of the 9-10 metre high building. We note that the applicant recognised that this proposal would be incompatible with the tree works proposed in application 161554, and had not submitted a revised tree-management plan. There was no attempt to present “well considered landscaping”, in contravention of Policy D1, and the proposed location would not “minimise adverse impacts on existing and future trees” nor avoid loss of “trees ... that contribute to local amenity”, both in contravention of Policy NE5 Trees and Woodlands.

- The layout of the proposed building clearly included substantial areas for reception, ancillary diversions (snooker/pool/table-tennis), and two areas labelled as “stores” on the south side clearly suitable for catering and entertainment. Should the real purpose of the entire building actually be for corporate entertainment, rather than for the benefit of the applicant’s family and close friends, then it would require a demonstration that such use would not cause any nuisance to neighbours under Policy H1.
- The proposal did not deliver “good quality design, careful siting and due consideration of scale”, contrary to the first sentence of SG4 Householder Development. In particular, siting a building of this size and design within 4 metres from the boundary (with a roof projecting almost a metre closer to the boundary) and having a roof-line reaching 9-10 metres above grade and over 30m long, would present a serious loss of amenity to the residents on both sides of St Ronan’s Drive as well as to members of the public using this road.
- The proposal had a roofline level with that of the main house, a scale and style which would “dominate the original form and appearance of the dwelling”, and a footprint markedly greater than that of the house, all in contravention of the intent of the current SG4 General Principles.
- The proposed building, at around 3 storeys high, with a barrel roof, larger in scale than the dwellinghouse, of a style jarring with every other building in the area, and having a negative impact on both the character and the amenity of the surrounding area, would contravene most of the provisions on Outbuildings in the revision of SG4 currently out for consultation.

For and on behalf of Culter Community Council,

Andy Roberts *Planning Liaison Officer*