

From: [REDACTED]
To: [P](#)
Subject: Planning application 180989/DPP Comment
Date: 05 July 2018 19:23:28

Mr & Mrs Andrew
328 Stonewood Road
Aberdeen
AB21 9JX

Reference to planning application 180989/DPP - Proposed extension of yard area including associated engineering and landscaping works

Unit 1
Stonewood Park
Dyce
Aberdeen
AB21 7DZ

Dear Mr Easton,

We write to object to the above mentioned application of extended yard.

The yard was recently extended from grass/woodland space to asphalt (photos 1,2,3) with no planning apparently required, and we would be very concerned about a similar plan being actioned toward the western boundary edge should permission be granted for this proposal and a precedent for extending set. If there is a requirement to extend so vastly within such a short space of time then perhaps the incorrect choice of building/location was chosen for these operations where more suitable locations could be available.

In no way will this proposal positively contribute to the amenity of the area and as agreeable as the planting of proposed 80 trees at the south western boundary next to the old canal bank/wall may be, the level and density of screening, 70-90cm initially, would be insufficient to compensate for the loss of desirable mature woodland natural screen currently enjoyed. It would take a generation for an acceptable screen to become established. (photos 4-7 showing views and vista of area character which would be impacted upon.

The proposal address is Stonewood Park, however the impact will mainly be to Stonewood Road and Cedar Avenue residents which is within a specifically zoned residential area and The Local Development plan Policy H1 Non residential use states refusal unless the proposal is considered complimentary to residential use. We do not consider the proposal complimentary and is contrary to the LDP, Greenspace Network NE3 and particularly Policy NE5 Trees and Woodland, loss of trees that contribute to landscape character.

Our home abuts the site and was built within a location surrounded by the character of

attractive desirable mature woodland and has won architectural awards no doubt enhanced by the value of neighbouring trees and it would be a severe disappointment to have an industrial yard, which was not there when we moved in, extended, coupled with the loss of the trees and wildlife.

The additional operational noise of an extended yard and continual reversing forklift beepers would not be welcomed along with the assumption bright yard lighting would be used with intrusive light pollution being a matter of concern as our home was designed to incorporate natural lighting and not external artificial lighting.

We know there is a substantial amount of subsurface groundwater flowing in the direction of the proposal and we would be worried about the risk of flooding to our property should a development have an impact on the water flow.

Photos 4-7 also shows our views from windows and clear vantage of which the yard would have of our full size Master Bedroom windows and changing room window of which overlooking loss of privacy issues are a big matter of concern as the felling of trees will afford a far wider area to be seen not only from the yard but much of Cedar Avenue would come into view.

We would welcome a planning officer to visit our home to inspect the visual and material impact of the proposal upon us and the loss of amenity the neighbourhood would incur should this proposal be granted.

Yours sincerely

Mr & Mrs Andrew