

Comments for Planning Application 211791/DPP

Application Summary

Application Number: 211791/DPP

Address: High Point 242 North Deeside Road Peterculter Aberdeen Peterculter AB14 0UQ

Proposal: Erection of 14 residential flats over 3 and 4 storeys, 1 shop unit and subdivision of existing flat to form 2 flats with associated infrastructure

Case Officer: Robert Forbes

Customer Details

Name: Dr Jennifer McConnachie

Address: 1A Malcolm Road, Peterculter AB14 0UT

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I do not object to the development of this site in principle. However, the proposal as it stands has several issues, including inaccuracies, one of which has been identified by Aberdeen City Council Senior Planner (shadow analysis). If these inaccuracies exist, how much confidence can we have in the rest of the proposal.

The brief was to develop a mixed use development but the proposal contains 14+2 flats and one retail unit, the latter replacing the unused current one. This suggests this is essentially a residential development.

The size of the development is far too large for the site, especially the height of the proposed buildings. The height, especially next to existing building, claims to be sympathetic to, and similar to, the existing buildings. The four storey height of the Gordon Hotel development is set well back from the road and the style is sympathetic to its surroundings. The proposal claims "...the street frontage is designed as 3 storeys with the roof profile matching that of the adjacent building on the site.". The adjacent building is only 1.5 storeys high and of a different profile. It thus does not "provide continuity of urban frontage" as claimed.

There is no mention in the proposal of how the development meets any low carbon policies. It claims to be "sustainable" but with no mention of how this is to be achieved. For example, two active charging points for 16 flats seems inadequate.

The Public Transport Bus information is almost completely incorrect and implies better public transport than exists. A simple search for information could have made this correct and leads to lack of confidence in the proposal. It is unclear how the development "encourages the effective

provision of public transport".

Car parking seems inadequate with one space per flat. Whilst the proposal claims this encourages public transport use, in practice this will mean that there will be problems with car parking spaces in the vicinity. The development reduces the number of existing parking spaces near the shops by approximately 7-8, both on the site and on North Deeside Road.

The Design Response on p16 states "... consideration given to impacts on neighbouring properties to ensure no unreasonable noise impact or loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy". The development, especially at the proposed 4 storey height, will overlook our property including the garden, reducing our privacy, and block sunlight especially during the winter months. The lighting and noise from the car park area will also impact our property.

A smaller scale, lower height development would be appropriate for this site.