

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 22 October 2013 17:05
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131363

Comment for Planning Application 131363

Name : Peter Duff
Address : 5 Argyll Place
Aberdeen AB25 2HU

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I have no objection to the conversion of this building into residential accomodation. However, I do object to the proposal to add to the present one-storey building's height. First, I think putting the planned structure onto the roof will not be in keeping with the building nor with the neighbourhood environment. Quite simply, it will look both odd and ugly. Second, the proposed extension on the roof will overlook my back garden, affecting its privacy and possibly its light. Third, the plan is extremely vague about the increase in elevation and what precisely will be situated on the present flat roof.

9, Argyll Place,
Aberdeen, AB25 2HU
September 22nd, 2013

Dear Sirs,

Proposed development at the Former Police Station, Midstocket Rd., AB15 5NE

Application 131363.

We wish to lodge three objections to the roof garden proposed in the above application.

1. People using the roof garden will have direct line of sight down into the gardens of the adjoining houses in Argyll Place.
2. A social occasion on the roof garden would emit more noise to a far greater extent than the same occasion held in one of the adjoining gardens.
3. The sun lounge would appear as a bizarre feature in Midstocket Rd., and in our neighbourhood it would be quite out of character.

Yours Sincerely,



A G Macdonald



J J Macdonald

Robert Vickers

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 20 October 2013 16:56
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131363

Comment for Planning Application 131363

Name : Susan Williams
Address: 5 Beechgrove Terrace
Aberdeen
AB15 5DR

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : No objection in principle to residential use - however I have strong reservations with regard to the upper roof garden and sun lounge as this would definitely not be in keeping with the Aberdeen Local Development plan - policies D1 D4 plus relevant aspects of H1 also lack of parking. (In other words unsuitable for this area.) Mr Wood applied for planning permission to convert No 12 Midsocket Road to a 1 bed. flat - we did not object - however at a later date he applied to change this to a 2 bed property - we were not notified and now face an appalling lack of decent workmanship which is another reason to turn down this proposal- he will also probably try this trick again of changing things - despite us looking directly on to all these properties we seem to have little or no say in developments.

I am fairly sure in the not too distant future he will attempt to purchase the piece of contentious ground between the Police Station and No12 - if he has not already done so!

Should Mr.Wood or any of his representatives make any attempt to bully me in any way you will be notified and I expect this to be notified to the planning meeting on 27 November.

I expect to be kept fully informed of future events with regard to this application.



James D. Anderson consultant architect

3 WESTFIELD TERRACE ABERDEEN AB252RU
Tel: [REDACTED] Email: [REDACTED]

23 October, 2013

Development Management
Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

FAO: Mr. Paul Williamson

Ref: Change Of Use From Former Police Station To Residential Accommodation
Application Number: 131363

Dear Mr. Williamson,

I am writing on behalf of Mrs. Catherine Robb, who lives at 3 Argyll Place, immediately adjacent to the Police Station. We wish to object to this application for change of use to a house, for various reasons:

1) The main objection against the development is the proposal for very obtrusive 2.3metre high walls enclosing the North and East edges of the property, to enclose an "amenity area". This constitutes a flagrant over-development of the site. These walls, added to the already high walls of the existing building, will form a daylighting barrier to the only area of garden in Mrs. Robb's house where it enjoys sunshine from the south and west.

We cannot envisage anyone enjoying using this space, which would overlook a very public and busily trafficked road intersection, and opposite, a bank and offices on the ground floor, with blocks of flats above. The proposals turn what is an ugly building, into a very ugly and rather ludicrous building.

We suspect an ulterior motive in forming the "amenity space". The only reason that we can see for such a feature is to make it easier to subsequently apply for turning the upper area into an enclosed second storey to the proposed house.

We should point out that some years ago, a proposal was made for a two storey house in the area immediately adjacent to the applicant's building. This was firstly rejected by Aberdeen City Council, and thereafter, after an appeal by the applicant, by the Secretary of State.

A much more appropriate proposal would be for a pitched slated roof, to make the building more attractive.

2) The applicants show the additional walls to be covered with timber linings. As well, the kitchen and toilet adjoin the north wall of the premises, which means that they will require ventilation. It should be stressed that the areas of the north and east walls lie in different ownerships to that of the applicant, and there is no right of access, nor means of maintenance in these areas. Due to this, we are unclear as to how the outer wall finishes could be completed as proposed.

3) As well, Aberdeen City Council Guidelines state that a development such as this requires parking facilities. The entrance elevation of the proposed development facing on to the lane off Mid Stocket Road is very narrow. This could lead to cars being parked there, and blocking access into Mrs. Robb's rear gate and garage, which are immediately adjacent.

In approving a recent application by the same client for premises in the two bedroomed flat constructed at number 12 Midstocket Road, due to the size of the development, parking restrictions were relaxed. However, how many more applications will be allowed the same relaxations, which accumulatively serve to add to the already extreme congested state of parking in this area? They all add up. This is not an existing City Centre proposal, rather, a new development in an outlying area of the city.

5) There is no disabled access into the premises, and it is impossible to provide such.

6) The existing windows on the north elevation are obscured glass. We are concerned that they could be changed to clear glass, taking away Mrs. Robb's privacy.

If the application for converting the premises were only confined to the internal refurbishment of the existing ground floor, many of our concerns would certainly be mitigated.

However, as the proposals stand, we strongly object, and request refusal of the application.

Yours Sincerely,



James D. Anderson

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number:	131363	
RECEIVED	25 OCT 2013	
Nor	Sou <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MAp
Case Officer Initials:	PW	
Date Acknowledged:		

8 Midsocket Road

Aberdeen

AB15 5NE

4th October 2013

Planning & Sustainable Development

Marischal College

Broad Street

Aberdeen

AB10 1AB

Reference Application Number 131363 Proposed Development Midsocket Road AB15 5NE

Dear Sir/Madam

With regard to the above planning application reference I hereby wish to object to this proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) Loss of amenity.
- 2) Previous application (some time ago) for two storeys was refused.
- 3) No right of access to garden for either build purpose or maintenance.

4) Lack of parking spaces (minimum requirement provision of 2 spaces).

5) Dangerous access from kitchen onto busy back lane.

6) Two elevations land locked (north and east elevations)


7) No details supplied on plan of finishes to walls, handrails, drains, roof etc.

8) This proposer has recently 'converted' another property next door at 10 Midstocket Road where several building regulations were contravened, to name but a few these included putting a window into a mutual gable wall (without consent of other owners) on the boundary of a mutual piece of ground which the council gave him permission as he advised them that he solely owned this piece of ground. (I have the deeds to prove that this is not true). Mutual joists were also cut and removed, again without any consent. The proposer is a public menace and truly believes that he can carry out any type of conversion he wishes with little regard of the planning authorities, laws or mutual owners of the buildings and I sincerely hope that his ambitions are treated with extreme caution by the planning department this time.

Please can you note my request that I wish to be notified of all further amended plans.

Thank you

Yours faithfully


ne R Main