

28 Parison Close,  
Richmond-upon-Thames,  
Surrey,  
TW9 4NH.

28th January 2013

Planning and Sustainable Development,  
Broad Street,  
Aberdeen,  
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir,

**Application Reference: 130020**  
**Installation of pedestrian and vehicular access gates, Bannermill Development**

I write to you in connection with the above mentioned planning application. I have examined the proposal and wish to object to the application in the strongest possible terms.

As you are aware the development is one of a number in the area completed over the last decade covering Bannermill and the old hospital site. Although these are high density developments, they have been constructed with clay bricks, light grey cladding and other complimentary materials to give a contemporary look and feel. The open access nature of the sites allows them to feel a part of the community in which they sit. The proposal, as it stands, uses granite stone and black coated fencing extensively which contrast with the local environment and will also create a very physical, prison-like, separation between the Bannermill development and the surrounding community. It is worth noting that what little fencing is currently in use at the development, on Beach Boulevard and Constitution Street, is of a light grey 'mesh' type, contrasting significantly with that proposed in the application. In short, the proposal is not compliant with Policy D1 of the Local Plan 2012 in that it does not consider its local environment and does not make a positive contribution to it.

My second objection is on more practical amenity and access grounds. I am a homeowner in the development and a wheelchair user, one of a number within the complex. Whilst gates cause inconvenience to able bodied users they present, at best, a significant barrier to those disabled people like me who lack the strength, dexterity and speed to manage them whilst also manoeuvring a wheelchair. At worst this barrier becomes insurmountable, as it would be for me. The frequent poor weather close to the sea front would also make navigating these barriers even more difficult, unpleasant and time consuming. FOB controlled access presents a particular barrier due to the difficulties of getting the gate open before the timing mechanism automatically re-engages the lock.

As well as personal access issues for disabled people, there are also problems with access for service providers. As I'm sure you appreciate disabled people are heavy users of delivery services and essential services in the home, such as personal and medical care, which may be provided by upwards of ten separate individuals visiting the residence during the course of a week. This proposal would raise significant barriers to accessing these services in a number of the blocks, including the one in which my flat is, which do not have direct access onto the street, but only into the new restricted access area.

It should also be noted that the installation of gates at Site Entrance A will mean that there will be no lowered kerbs in the vicinity within the development. This will mean that there will be no entry or exit through this route for wheelchairs without negotiating a significant barrier in the form of a high kerbstone.

When I moved to Aberdeen I was delighted to have found this development because suitable housing is extremely difficult to find for disabled people<sup>1</sup>. Although I am temporarily not living in Bannermill whilst I am away working in London, if this proposal was to proceed it would effectively make it impossible for me to return to live in the complex. The barriers to access raised would also make this the case for other disabled people.

In short, this application represents a material change in access to the buildings with a detrimental effect on accessibility, contrary to paragraph 0.3 of Approved Document M. Also, the application does not include an Access Statement as detailed in paragraph 0.20 of the same document recording how the application may comply with the guidance.

Finally it is questionable whether the stated motivation behind the project, to improve security and reduce crime, is supported by the evidence presented. I personally have knowledge of two incidents of theft or vandalism that this proposal sets out to address, both of which were at the AB24 5EH postcode. On neither occasion were they carried out by passers-by, but were in fact perpetrated by individuals invited into the development and were directed at specific residents. Neither incident would have been prevented by this proposal. The evidence supporting this application is drawn from a simple search performed for reported crimes, but these results are of little value without any analysis to assess how many of these incidents would have been prevented or mitigated by the measures outlined in the proposal.

If this application is to be considered by committee, and if my schedule allows, I would like to attend the meeting. I would therefore be grateful if you could inform me of the date of any such meeting.

Yours faithfully,

  
Alan Benson

1 [http://\[redacted\]](http://[redacted])

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 130020		
RECEIVED - 4 FEB 2013		
Nor	Sou	Map
	Report	GEE - NAA
Date Acknowledged: 08/02/13		

**From:** <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**To:** <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**Date:** 22/01/2013 19:59  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 130020

Comment for Planning Application 130020

Name : Emma Duguid  
Address : 31 Bannermill Place

Telephone :

Email :

type :

Comment : After looking at all the supporting documents, i cant not object to how much i think this will improve the look and to some extent the safety of the development.

However, I OBJECT, on the basis that we will only be issued with 1 car entry fob. My main concern is should something happen such as i fall in the shower and i manage to make a call to my family who have keys to our house to come and help me, they are now unable to get into the complex, as we have not been issued with enough "fobs".

The issue of the fob's and the entry to the complex with the new gates have not been addressed and i think this is a key factor in the discussion.



**From:** <webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**To:** <pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk>  
**Date:** 22/01/2013 20:01  
**Subject:** Planning Comment for 130020

Comment for Planning Application 130020

Name : Paul Goonan

Address : 31 Bannermill Place

Telephone :

Email :

type :

Comment : After looking at all the supporting documents, i cant not object to how much i think this will improve the look and to some extent the safety of the development.

However, I OBJECT, on the basis the issue of the fob's and the entry to the complex with the new gates have not been addressed and i think this is a key factor in the discussion.



# MEMO



ABERDEEN  
CITY COUNCIL

To	Gavin Evans Planning & Infrastructure	Date	19/02/2013
		Your Ref.	P130020 (ZLF)
		Our Ref.	TR/IH/1/51/2
From	Roads Projects		
Email			
Dial			
Fax			

Roads Projects  
**Enterprise, Planning & Infrastructure**  
Aberdeen City Council  
Business Hub 4  
Ground Floor North  
Marischal College  
Broad Street  
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

**Planning application no. P130020**  
**Bannermill Development, Bannermill Place, Aberdeen**  
**Installation of pedestrian and vehicular access gates**

I have considered the above planning application and have the following observations:

**1.0 Proposals**

1.1 The applicants intend to erect security gates and fencing at all three access points to the development.

**2.0 Access**

2.1 The installation of the proposed security fences and gates will prevent the general public from legitimately using walking and cycling routes through the development. The development, in common with all modern sites, currently provides routes for pedestrians and cyclists to pass through the scheme which provide attractive, convenient routes following desire lines, encouraging travel by sustainable modes of transport.

2.2 The installation of gates will obstruct established routes through the development that are well used. The creation of a gated community will be to the detriment of the connectivity and permeability of the local area by sustainable modes of transport.

2.3 The current access points and routes were deliberately designed into the scheme and are seen as essential parts of the development. The alternative routes are convoluted, adding time and distance to journeys. These aspects will be amplified by the fact that the routes through the site have been available for a number of years. The combined effect of these factors will be to encourage people to drive.

Gordon McIntosh  
Corporate Director

### **3.0 Conclusion**

3.1 In light of my comments above, I would object to this planning application.

**Iain Hamilton**

Engineer (Developments and Traffic)