

Environmental Policy team response - planning application, masterplan, and development framework consultations

PROPOSAL DETAILS

	Enter details in this column
Application / plan name	Erection of two detached dwellings, formation of associated private garden ground and car parking (Resubmission of previous application ref: 161777/DPP). at Burnside Poultry Units, Little Clinterty, Aberdeen
Application reference number / reference	170395/DPP
Planning case officer	Robert Forbes
Date of request	24/05/17
Date response required	15/05/17
Date of response	15/05/17
EP team (name of responder)	Lina-Elvira Back
Other EP team members	Anne-Marie Gauld Deb Munro
Other Services consulted by EP	Choose an item. Specify:

POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Relevant policy and legislation	Enter text in this column
Relevant LDP policies	NE8 - Natural Heritage D2 - Landscape D1 - Quality of Placemaking by Design NE5 - Trees and Woodlands

Relevant Supplementary Guidance/Technical Advice Note	SG/TAN; Townscape and Landscape Supplementary Guidance Natural Environment Supplementary Guidance Natural Heritage: Section 4 - Protected Species; Section 5 – Non-designated Sites; Section 6 – Principles for Protecting and Enhancing Natural Heritage Trees and Woodlands: Section 7
Other key references, e.g. ACC strategies, Local Biodiversity Action Plan, Scottish Planning Policy, National Planning Framework, TPO/Cons area/GSN GIS tool	Other Key References British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations

COMMENTS

Topic	Comments (including compliance, non-compliance and reasoning)
Natural Heritage (Anne-Marie Gauld)	<p>The site does not fall within an area highlighted as having habitat suitable for bats, however, the ecology and biodiversity section of the Sustainability Report states that it will be considering a number of measures including bird and bats boxes. If it is suspected that bats are using the buildings or trees within the site, then a bat survey must be conducted and reference must be made to section 7 of the Natural Heritage SG for Bats and Development.</p> <p>This is bird breeding season and a survey of the buildings and trees for breeding birds must be carried out. Old farm buildings can be suitable for bird species such as swallows, house martins and barn owls and, therefore, should be included in the survey as well as any trees affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>We welcome the consideration of measures to support the diversity wildlife that has been noted at the site and would request an ecological survey to support this and establish what is within and around the site. This will help to establish what mitigation measures and enhancement features would be best suited for the site.</p>
Landscape (Deb Munro)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is located within a relatively flat, open, predominantly rural landscape characterised by sparsely scattered, small nucleated groups of dwellings and farm buildings, and with very infrequent, small groups of trees or shelter belts. It is highly

	<p>visible from public roads around the area, including the A96 which is a gateway to the city. The open character of this landscape provides a setting and foreground for views to Tyrebagger Hill.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There appears to be little significant difference to the previous refused proposal. The dwellings are of about the same size and the garden areas reduced. The two dwelling are spaced apart along the track, and one in particular is detached from the existing cluster of properties to the south east. 3. Refer to policy D2. No reference has been made to the Aberdeen Landscape Character Assessment, and the character and sensitivities of the surrounding landscape. The reference to landscape proposals is inadequate to demonstrate how landscape impacts will be addressed. In the design statement it states briefly that <i>'the boundaries will be landscaped and planted to age gracefully while screening neighbouring properties without the need for tall timber fences'</i>. More detail is required on how this would be achieved in reality. It would not be possible to prevent future timber fences being erected around the plots, thereby urbanising the character of the landscape. 4. In conjunction with recent development in this area, the cumulative effects of increasing the size and number of groups of houses/buildings in this landscape needs to be considered. 5. If the area of stone and rubble is unsuitable for cultivation (area 1, page 7 of the Design Statement), and cannot be used for agriculture, how can this be converted to garden, which would also need cultivated ground?
<p>Trees (Lina-Elvira Back)</p>	<p>As trees are present on site and within 15m of the development boundary, as per our SG, all trees within the site boundary and within 15 m of the proposed development should be surveyed; the tree survey should be undertaken to BS5837:2012 and must include a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey schedule; ▪ Tree Constraints Plan; ▪ Arboricultural Impact Assessment; ▪ Tree Protection Plan; ▪ Tree Planting/Landscaping Plan and, where necessary, ▪ Arboricultural Method Statements <p>As a tree survey has not be submitted, we cannot assess the impact this development will have on trees, especially those within 15 m but outwith the site boundary.</p>

CONCLUSION

Summary of environmental effects of concern and further information required

Natural Heritage

More surveys are required to be able to assess the impact of the proposals;

1. Request an ecological survey to establish what diversity of species is there and should include surveys of bats, breeding birds (including barn owl, house martins and swallows), amphibians and invertebrates.
2. Mitigation and enhancement plans should reflect the results of the ecological survey.

Landscape

Summary

1. Aside from other policy issues, e.g. Greenbelt, the current layout is not significantly different from previous refused proposals, and presents a new residential development extending, rather than clustered around, the current group of properties.
2. The development is in a relatively flat, open, predominantly rural landscape characterised by scattered, small groups of dwellings and houses. It is highly visible from public roads including the A96.
3. There is no evidence of consideration of landscape character, or an indication as to how the urbanisation of the plots through introduction of fences can be avoided in future. There is no information provided on structural landscape proposals to help integrate the development with the character of the surrounding landscape.
4. There is a potential issue of cumulative effects with other recent development in the area.
5. We query how the poor ground to the west can be cultivated as a garden when it cannot be cultivated for agriculture.

Trees

Further survey is required to be able to assess the impact of the development on trees;

1. A tree survey should be undertaken to BS5837:2012 and must include a:
 - Survey schedule;
 - Tree Constraints Plan;
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
 - Tree Protection Plan;
 - Tree Planting/Landscaping Plan and, where necessary,
 - Arboricultural Method Statements

--

EP TEAM ADMIN

Environmental Policy Team monitoring	Enter text in this column
Site visited?	No