

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 9 Jul 2018 17:30:03 +0100
To: PI
Subject: Application Ref 180989/DPP - Resident Objection

Dear Matthew,

I am writing to note my opposition to the new planning application submitted by Marwood Group Ltd in Stoneywood. It's basically the same application submitted in Oct 2017 only proposing to leave a slightly wider strip of trees than the 2m they proposed last time.

I'm very disappointed to see a second application showing total disregard to the local area and residents. I hope the planning application board take the growth of this company into consideration when reviewing the application. It's been on the site for less years than any of the adjacent neighbours, and have already extended their yard once or twice. Now they require a bigger premises. How long before they outgrow the current facility and move for a larger premises, leaving behind a forever altered landscape? They won't be there in 100 years, which is how long it will take the proposed saplings to replace the mature trees they propose to remove. With an abundance of commercial premises available, even in the local vicinity, it seems absurd and obscene that a company would make such a selfish proposal.

Please find below the points I submitted last year in objection to the last application. I've re-submitted them as my view remains the same. All points remain relevant to the new application.

Kind regards,

Kelly Murray
2 Cedar Avenue, Stoneywood



I received a Neighbour Notification Notice (ACC REF: 180989/DPP) in relation to Unit 1, Stoneywood Park, Dyce, AB21 7DZ. Marwood Group Ltd wants to extend their industrial yard. Please accept this correspondence as a strong objection to the proposal. I live at 2 Cedar Avenue, directly opposite the proposed yard extension on the south side.

Impact on Amenity & Design of yard: height trees / barrier

The applicant plans on clearing about 2550m². of dense woodland that separates them from our residential street (Cedar Avenue) with the exception of a proposed 8m wide 'landscaped strip'. They propose to plant a hedge on

this border. This to replace over 100 mature trees reported in the applicant's own tree report as being approximately 100 yrs old, and many 20m+ in height! Hedges planted on our estate four years ago are not yet established, so this planting will do nothing to provide screening or a barrier between industrial land and residential. Our home and our direct neighbours on Cedar Avenue would directly overlook the proposed yard extension. See pics below. Apart from loss of view and loss of privacy, this would result in increased noise and pollution, not to mention the detrimental impact on wildlife.

Adjacent to their proposed new yard, the applicant intends to plant 80 new trees, which in principle affords a better barrier between the yard and homes at the Southwest. In practise however - removing huge mature trees and replacing them with saplings 70cm - 90cm high will have a huge impact on the character and amenity of the neighbouring housing.

The applicant already extended their yard a bit, and removed trees to do so. Those works evidently didn't require planning permission as there were no notices issued. Our outlook at the moment is onto dense woods. In the winter when the trees are bare you can see more of the industrial area beyond. However, if the extension goes ahead we will be directly overlooking an industrial yard full of bright red engineering plant, their building, and the BP building beyond.

Compatibility with other uses in the area and affect on trees

The applicant significantly plays down many aspects in their application:

1. Impact on wildlife: We've been a bit spoiled with our surroundings. It's pretty remarkable to live in Aberdeen surrounded by mature woodland, along with squirrels, deer, rabbits, owls and bats on your doorstep. We even spot foxes and woodpeckers. Will be gutted to trade that in for red containers and plant hire equipment etc. In the past four years here, we've seen so many trees lost from the landscape already. The tree report notes [REDACTED] evidenced on the site and proposes to protect any new trees from the same which establishes these animals frequent the area.
2. Impact on neighbouring residents and how it will affect the look of the whole avenue. There is a hard boundary between Stonewood Estate and the industrial area beyond. The woodland strip serves as a natural barrier between Cedar Avenue and Stonewood Park. Policies H1 'Residential Areas', NE5 'Trees and Woodland' and NE1 'Green Space Network' surely all constitute valid grounds for why the woods should remain.

3. Applicant states the trees are in poor condition, but their tree report only mentions 4 that need to be felled due to condition. They refer to scrubby self seeded trees yet their report details 'dense trees to the south' include Norway Maple, Sycamore, Beech, Whitebeam, Lime, Wych Elm and Scots Pine. So evidently these are not all self seeded trees.

Precedent

The area south of the yard, part of which is proposed to accommodate the yard extension is zoned as part of the 'OP17 Stoneywood Estate' Residential site. Some of the wooded areas are identified as being part of the 'Green Space Network NE1'. The applicant suggests this is an error and that planning should be granted. I would counter propose that it's not an error, and I'd ask that a tree protection order be considered for the entire tree corridor that runs the length of the street to the river side. It constitutes a natural barrier between the residential area and the industrial land beyond. I fear that if planning permission is granted to Marwood it may set a precedent whereby other industrial units long the corridor follow suit and all the remaining woods would be at risk.

Safety - creating instability by felling

Their tree report also records, 'The felling of trees at the south-western corner of the group has exposed trees at the recently created edge to an increased risk of storm damage. These individuals will require to be closely monitored, particularly where they occur within falling distance of the neighbouring driveway to the south, and neighbours house to the west. The risk of storm damage is very real, as evidenced in the area recently. After one stormy October night a couple of years ago, a strip of 14 mature trees behind our house fell all at once, having been weakened by felling of surrounding trees. I'd propose that removing any further portion of the woods may lead to the whole lot being lost over time.

Applicant cites 'unmanaged woodland' opposite 'recent' Dandara housing plots. As a local resident for more than four years I can assure Marwood (who have owned their site for approx. 1 year) that a grounds maintenance factor is paid to keep the landscaped grounds regularly maintained.

Economic Consideration

The applicant may claim they are creating a robust and resilient economy, but what is economic development of one local company if it is to the detriment of several residential neighbours? We understand that devaluation of property is not a material consideration of the planning department but it would be a very real implication if this planning permission is granted.

It is wholly incorrect and biased to state, as they do in their application, that 'The overall character of the area is that of a commercial location with offices and yard areas.' Perhaps at the north facing side of the applicant's property, but not at the south where the proposed extension is planned.

In conclusion, nothing about the proposed planning application would contribute to the amenity of the area from a resident's point of view and it would destroy the function of the area for natural habitats too. We therefore ask that the application is denied. Looking forward to hearing from you in due course. Please confirm receipt of this representation and advise if any further information is required.

Best regards,

Kelly Murray

2 Cedar Avenue, Stoneywood, AB21 9AF



5.

5.

6.

7.