

Ashley Broomhill Community Council



Logo by Primary 4 Ashley Road School 09.

Planning Officer

Ken Eddie
14 Ashley Gardens
Aberdeen
AB10 6RQ.

Date- Tuesday, 5 June 2012

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P & N Strachan
37 Broomhill Avenue
Aberdeen
Aberdeen City
AB10 6JL

Agent:

Officer: Sheila Robertson

Application Reference:
20691

Local Authority Reference:

Proposal Description:

Proposed raised area to driveway g/l, proposed new garage raised to driveway g/l

Application type:

Detailed Planning Permission

Dear Sheila,

We have had the neighbors at 35 Broomhill Avenue asking us to support their objection to this proposed addition to their jointed site.

Our Chair has asked that the Councilors also support the objection we meet on Thursday so I can report after the meeting to you.

I personally feel that a site meeting would support the neighbors. As it is a complete over kill to the existing additions already built.

Regards ken Eddie for Ashley Broomhill Community Council.

Application Reference: 120691

From: <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
To: <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>
Date: 29/05/2012 09:19
Subject: Planning Comment for 120691

Comment for Planning Application 120691

Name : M Yeats
Address : 31 Broomhill Avenue
Aberdeen
AB10 6JL

Telephone

Email :

type :

Comment : The proposal is for an extended garage and there will be a raised area at the front however this area is marked off by a wooden fence and so it would not be possible to position a car in front of the garage to the manover it in and out of the garage without the side fence being removed and therefore it would appear that the use will be for a workshop or store rather than a garage.

In addition to the previous building extension this would seem an over development of such a small plot.

These are comments are observations and not any form of objection as my property is not affected by this proposal however the blocking of sunlight will have a detrimental effect on neighbours at number 35!

35 Broomhill Avenue
Aberdeen
AB10 6JL
01.06.12
Application no. 120691

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the notification dated 17th May 2012 in which we were informed of the above planning application. We are replying to strongly object to this application.

Firstly on having looked at the plans there are several substantial errors such as one diagram showing no.35s 0.9 metre fence shown to be just below the level of the driveway. This is incorrect and understates the amount by which the ground level will be raised to be level with the driveway by 0.61 metres. Both properties have the same ground level. Another discrepancy is the height of the garage with the highest point being shown in one diagram to be 2/3 of the height of the windows in the current extension and on another diagram show the roof to be slightly higher than the current extension roof. An important area that has been ignored in the one of the diagrams is an area of 3 feet in width running from the driveway to the proposed raised area that is 10" lower than the driveway level. The applicant would only be able to raise the level on their side and this will have a direct effect on access to the proposed garage.

We object on the grounds that the proposed development of the site will have a detrimental effect on our residential amenity due to the over dominance of the structure being excessive in height, mass and length which will stand along the length of the boundary between numbers 35 and 37. We estimate that the structure will have a height of approximately 4.0 to 4.6 metres from ground level but are unsure of this due to the discrepancies in the plans. This will mean that from approximately 1pm our sunlight will be adversely affected and there will be a significant loss of light over a large area of our garden. The outlook from the rooms at the rear of our property will be greatly changed in a negative way reducing our amenity. The property was built in 1939 and we have lived here since purchasing our property in 1980. An important factor was the south facing garden with a pleasant, natural and open outlook. We have the benefit of the sun in the garden from morning to early evening and spend a lot of time enjoying the outside space and sunny aspect.

We object on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site. The applicant has already extended substantially on their site with a rear 2 storey extension, a front porch and the front garden area was completely removed and developed for parking.

We object on the grounds that access to the proposed garage is insufficient. The proposed garage is to provide 2 new motor vehicle parking spaces and we believe that there is not adequate width in the access area from the drive and through the gate to the proposed garage. This means that the proposed garage cannot be used for its purpose. Secondly these spaces would not be able to be used freely as we and the applicant park a vehicle on the shared driveway daily, one in front of the other.

We would like to record the fact that there would be no access given onto our land for any building/maintenance to be carried out on the proposed development.

Yours faithfully

Note of Objection to: -

**Planning Application 120691
Proposed Raised Area to Driveway, at
37 Broomhill Avenue, Aberdeen.**

Reason for objection is: -

1. Overbearing structure dominating the surrounding neighbourhood.
2. Over-development of the site.
3. Overshadowing of neighbouring garden.
4. Inaccurate representation on the drawings.
5. Miscellaneous.

1. Overbearing structure

At 10.00m long and 4.60m high this structure will have an extremely imposing and overbearing appearance on the near neighbourhood, particularly in the rear gardens of these family homes. Due to the size of this structure it requires to have a light coloured finish. Regrettably there is no indication on the plans as to what colour of finish is to be applied. I would therefore request that a planning condition is attached to any approval requiring a light coloured finish, not white, be applied and maintained over the duration of the structure's lifetime and to the satisfaction of the adjoining proprietor whose property is directly affected by this structure. Apart from the garage the applicant is proposing to erect a 1.8m (6ft) high fence to the apron directly in front of the garage. However, this will in effect mean a 3.3m (11ft) high structure to the adjoining garden. Everything about the design of this application appears to cause maximum nuisance to the adjoining property due to its mass and ability to block sunlight to the garden area.

2. Over-development of the site

This property is a 6 bed roomed 4 storey semi-detach property with an extension to the rear of the original structure, a porch extension to the front elevation and front garden converted to form hard standing by concreting over. The addition of this workshop would cover approximately 50% of the rear (and only remaining) garden area and amount to circa 70% of the total feu.

As this is a 6 bedroom house it would be reasonable to expect it to be inhabited by a family thus requiring a reasonable amount of garden/leisure space. The eco footprint of this property is already far greater than can be sustained by the feu and any additional development will only add to this.

3. Overshadowing of neighbouring garden;

The rear garden of 35 and 37 Broomhill Avenue lies circa east of this proposed development and 1.55m (5ft 9 inches) below street level and the common access driveway. The applicant has suggested in their drawings that the floor level of their workshop will be level with the driveway, it then has a further 7 feet to eaves level and a further 3 feet to accommodate the lean to roof, thus meaning that a 16ft high wall will lie along the majority of the garden boundary to number 35. At 10m (32ft) long the structure is capable of taking two motor cars, however, as mentioned below, it is not possible to access the structure