

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Local Development Plan Consultation - CRAIGDEN (s/n B03-04)
Date: 07 May 2019 16:34:55
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Middleton

Thank you for your email.


I have been on annual leave of late so apologies for my delay in responding.

I will pass your email to the ldp@aberdeencity.gov.uk inbox from here your email will be registered. Once your details have been inputted into our system you will be issued with a respondent identification number. The email will be registered under your name.

Please note we are receiving a high level of response currently so it may take a couple of days to send the respondent identification number to you.

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best
Donna



From: Gordon Middleton

Sent: 01 May 2019 09:35

To: Donna Laing

Cc: A Lister Fraser; Linda Middleton; Dav; Jennifer Stewart

Subject: Local Development Plan Consultation - Craighden (s/n B03-04)

Hello Donna,

I have been given your name by our local councillor Jennifer Stewart in relation to the ongoing consultation on the Local Development Plan as somewhere our community can record their views about the proposed site above. The site is amenity land within our Craighden community and was not identified as a preferred site in the Draft Main Issue Report.

A Lister Fraser, myself, and Jennifer Stewart met with Andrew Brownrigg and Lucy Greene met prior to the issue of the report to discuss the LDP process and were told that the consultation period could result in sites moving between preferred and not preferred. Consequently our community is concerned that the status of this amenity land may change as part of the ongoing consultation and there appears no easy way for us to reinforce our concerns around this site.

Therefore I would like our concerns formally recorded and considered as part of this process in the event that the landowner makes representations to change the status of this community amenity land. Our main concerns are -

- Loss of Amenity space
- Reduced quality of life due to loss of valuable green space
- Increased personal risk due to increased road traffic and access via a blind corner

I have provided more specific detail below in terms of these concerns.

Please confirm safe receipt of these concerns and I trust they will be recorded and considered appropriately as part of the process.

Kind regards
Gordon Middleton



The proposed land site (0.59 Ha) is currently part of the Craighden residential land development. CALA received approval for the Craighden housing development circa 1997 on the basis of a proposed site layout including amenity land and the proposed development site. The proposed site has been used as an amenity area for local children to play, and also as access for dog-walkers and a nature corridor for deer from the nearby Maidenraig nature reserve as well as smaller creatures and bird-life. As Craighden residents we have the following specific concerns regarding the proposed development for a Care Home on the site.

1	The amenity land was created as a condition of the Craighden development approval and we don't understand why this can be subsequently deemed no longer appropriate. Indeed, CALA had to engage the Greenbelt Company to own and maintain this site in a manner that was fit for the amenity intent of the original planning approval. The Craighden population has not changed and hence the proportion of amenity land seems equally relevant to us at this time. Also, it seems to us that a lowering development on this land would contradict policy H1 Residential Areas in the ALDP 2017 where, among other things, development will only be approved if "does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space". On top of this non-residential use will be refused if "it can be demonstrated that the use would cause no conflict with, or any nuisance to, the enjoyment of existing residential amenity". Despite what the developer says on the ALDP allocation this is a significant loss to the community and it surprises us how someone who does not live in the community and has no idea how the amenity area is enjoyed by that community can suggest it will not be a loss to that community.
2	The proposed development land plot of 0.59 Ha is bound on all four sides by residential (3 sides) and Hospital buildings hence would represent a significant erosion of the surrounding green space, in addition to concerns regarding increased infrastructure and a loss of amenity space for the existing community. The loss of proven wildlife habitat is also considered significant. Again referring to the ALDP 2017 there are numerous policies which development in this area would contradict such as - <ul style="list-style-type: none">• D1 - Duty by Place-making by Design, particularly with regard to being "safe and pleasant" where the traffic implications will mean this is not achieved• D2 - Landscape, where development will disrupt the existing landscape framework. I note the Aurora Planning report included with the application tries to create doubt in this area ("no ecological value") but, to be clear, the only reason this amenity area is currently not adding to the environment is due to the large vehicle which the developer has abandoned on the site (and which has now been vandalised), the debris they have deliberately left to rot throughout the site and the general lack of upkeep making it uninviting for the community and wildlife alike. Some may say this is a deliberate attempt to create an impression of an abandoned area with no community or use or value in terms of green space and in this respect the developer has been successful as the community can no longer use the space and the deer which used to appear regularly on the site have not now been seen for months.• NE1 - Green Space Network. Where "The Council will protect, promote and enhance the wildlife, access, recreation, ecosystem services and landscape value of the Green Space Network..." We are site no 87.• NE5 - Trees and Woodlands, where "there is a presumption against all activities and development that will result in the loss of, or damage to, trees and woodlands that contribute to nature conservation, landscape character, local amenity or climate change adaptation and mitigation". Despite what is said in the Aurora Planning report the developer has already cut down significant amounts of trees, bushes, etc on the area such that a TPO had to be put in to prevent any further damage to the area. With these actions and the fact that much of the debris remains onsite years later I have no faith in the developer acting in an appropriate manner when they say the development ".....will have no significant impact on the tree preservation order....."• NE6 - Flooding, Drainage and Water Quality. I note the application comments with interest here as, living in the community, I know how much water runs off the site in question into adjacent gardens. Careful consideration of the potential impacts here is required.• NE9 - Access and Informal Recreation. Whilst there are no core paths on the area it compromises existing access rights and this would be exacerbated during any construction phase.
3	The site is a relatively small site 0.59 Ha (which includes a steep bank section on the approach road which is not practical for development yet has been included in the land area - presumably to show the ration of infrastructure in a better light) and whilst the developer suggests their buildings will take up 23% of the available area, the parking allocation and external (Building plant, bins/ recycling, etc. will represent a significant proportion of the total (realistic) land area. Development would result in a detrimental imbalance in the immediate infrastructure.
4	Site access to the proposed development is of concern given there is no existing access, nor is it obvious that entry/ exit access could be safely incorporated. Access from both the north (via hospital perimeter road) and the south (via Craighden) have significant limitations and safety concerns due to added risk to the existing community, road-users and in particular, young children. Vehicular access via Craighden, would only be possible on the main Craighden entrance corner to the cul-de-sac and introduce significant risk to residents due to various blind spots on this corner. The hospital perimeter road (to the north) is single track and has a significant elevation gain above the proposed development site. Access via the Eday Road hospital entrance would also involve circa 1/2 mile of travel within the hospital grounds to gain access to the proposed development and a similar exit distance via the existing one-way system - clearly this would result in increased traffic within the hospital site with an according increase in risk to people. The Craighden entry/ exit road (including the bridge) is already more congested with traffic and parking than originally anticipated due to Woodend Hospital visitors and staff resulting in the addition of sections of double-yellow lines in recent years. The parking blocks one side of the main Craighden access road during most daytime/ evening hours hence an additional access road is considered impractical and unsafe given the limited entrance space available into the proposed site (single track at best, with existing tree height clearance restrictions). On top of this the nursery at the entrance to the hospital on Queens Road has significant amounts of pick up and drop off on the street and I am concerned that additional visitor traffic in the area will increase the danger here (e.g. the nursery car park is used by hospital visitors already so the situation would worsen).
5	The proposed site currently has a large gradient necessitating additional earthworks should any development proceed. This together with the tie-in to existing services (electricity, gas, water, waste) and site drainage represents additional disruption to nearby residents during construction and merely adds to the overall negative environmental impact of any such development. Also, looking at the outline plan provided I have concerns over the levels. The houses at Craighden numbers 14 and 15 are significantly lower than the proposed development leaving them significantly exposed to both the traffic at the entrance to their site and the proposed car park. I am not convinced any amount of landscaping will offset the noise and disruption this would create.
6	I am sceptical regarding the stated overall benefits to the community of a care home on this site and presume the city care/ planning departments have an overall philosophy regards the overall number and district location of required care accommodation and what the optimum size of care homes are i.e. rather than simply proposing a care home on a site to avoid residential restrictions, a development proposal should fit within the overall philosophy and community needs. The current landowner (Rubislaw Estates) has chosen not to maintain the amenity areas, deliberately disturbed the topography of the land, randomly cut down several trees, left felled tree debris, not addressed a Japanese knotweed issue and abandoned a vehicle rendering the site unsafe (recently removed after 2 years following police intervention) and unsuitable for the decreed amenity purpose. Ironically, the apparent deliberate deterioration of the amenity areas surrounding Craighden development is grossly at odds with the stated environmental and community benefits within the Rubislaw Estates proposal. The state of the designated amenity land is currently being pursued by the Craighden Residents with our local councillor, the city Planning Department and the Police.