



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

30 September 2013

Dear Mr Prentice,

Planning Application 131266: Erection of new house in grounds of 469 North Deeside Road

I am writing on behalf of the Cults Bielside and Milltimber Community Council (CBMCC) to share our views on the proposed building of a new house in the grounds of 469 North Deeside Road, Cults. The Community Council has no objections to the house being built as it appears to meet the guidelines set out in the Supplementary Guidance: Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages March 2012. We are concerned about the setting of precedents and would note that this application is viewed solely on its merits, with any future subdivision of curtilages being subject to a stand-alone review. We have a few concerns with the plan for 469 N Deeside Road which we hope will be addressed through conditions as part of the granting of planning permission;

- a) The retention of tree presence around the boundaries as shown in the site plan, now and in the future, to maintain privacy with surrounding properties and the Deeside railway line.
- b) The access for construction will be through the main driveway of 469 North Deeside Road and will not impact resident access along West Cults Road.
- c) New house occupant driveway access will be through 469 North Deeside Road.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Roberts

Peter Roberts
Planning Liaison Officer

Copy to: Councillor Marie Boulton, Councillor Aileen Malone, Councillor Tauqeer Malik

Robert Vickers

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 19 September 2013 11:15
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131266

Comment for Planning Application 131266

Name : Mrs Carolyn Armstrong
Address : 17 South Avenue
Aberdeen
AB159LQ

Telephone :

Email :

type :

Comment : I wish to place an objection to the proposed planning application for a new build, application number 131266, 469 North Deeside Road, Cults, Aberdeen, AB159LQ.

The reasons for this are many and varied but include, Past History, Impact on amenity, Design, Compatibility with business next door, proximity to border, Affect on Tree Preservation order, change of character to site, Height of new build with no point of reference available, Past refusal by Aberdeen City Council with no change in the reasons given then, no information on excavation works required due to substantial drop on site of ground level, Impact on driveway drop and implications for excavation, affect on trees, Design, size of development, loss of amenity to neighbours, affect on boarding animals directly on boundary, recent removal of trees and severe lopping of trees, under order that have already taken place, exterior look with wood cladding and plain walls not in keeping with granite homes in line, loss of visual amenity to east of proposal, impact of shadowing and sunlight, to name a few. I intend to submit more detailing by e-mail but due to the reduced timescale to view the plans online, only made available on the 12th September and the inability to have questions answered by an officer, I will send these in due course and feel this should not be seen as detrimental to my points being addressed as it is still not possible for me to work out the exact height as no reference is made on the plans as to which starting depth is used in relation to the eastern neighbouring properties and the impact of this.

As we have been superior titledeed holders we held discussions with Mr Tully on his application and as he has now sold the area with supposed planning permission in place, the new proposals are not what we had agreed with him and in light of these discussions we had legally agreed to remove the hold we had on his grounds if he were applying for a 3 bed on the site and placed a minimum of 10m from our boundary so as not to affect the running of our continuing business directly next door.

This very different proposal has clearly severe implications on this and our trust in Mr Tully to work with us on his ability to build somewhere on the site that would be acceptable. We are extremely annoyed at the changes in proposals which we feel very strongly affect both our residence and that of our business. I would hope that these lists of points, along with a more detailed explanation will be noted and considered in your deliberations.

Robert Vickers

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 19 September 2013 10:31
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131266

Comment for Planning Application 131266

Name : Douglas Armstrong
Address : West Cults Lodge
17 South Avenue
Cults
Aberdeen
AB15 9LQ

Telephone :

Email :

type :

Comment : REF 131266

WE WISH TO OBJECT TO THE ABOVE APPLICATION.

FIRSTLY WE TAKE ISSUE WITH THE NOTICE RECEIVED 29TH AUGUST FOR THE APPLICATION AND THAT THE FACT THAT THE DRAWINGS WERE NOT ABLE TO BE SEEN ON LINE FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT OF NEW HOUSE UNTIL 12TH SEPT WHICH CERTAINLY REDUCED THE AMOUNT OF TIME TO OBJECT.

THIS CAUSED US TIME TO SUBMIT THE OBJECTION AND OUR CONSULTANTS.

THE PROPOSED HOUSE IS NEXT DOOR TO OUR BOARDING KENNELS WHICH WILL AFFECT THE RESIDENTS.

WE HAVE ENSURED THAT THE KENNEL BUSINESS TRIES TO REDUCE THE NOISE ELEMENT WITH VARIOUS METHODS TO SATISFACTORILY EFFECT THIS OVER THE YEARS TO THE SATISFACTION OF ALL NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES BUT A NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL CAUSE MORE PROBLEMS WITH A NEW OWNER WHICH WE DO NOT WANT TO HAPPEN. WE HAVE BEEN IN BUSINESS FOR A LONG TIME AND DO NOT WANT TO CLOSE THE BUSINESS FROM FUTURE COMPLAINTS.

WE HAVE DISCUSSED THE KENNEL AREA AND DID SUBMIT PLANS OURSELVES TO THE COUNCIL TO CHANGE THE KENNEL AREA AND GARAGE AREA INTO A HOUSES. THIS WAS WITHDRWN BEFORE THE MEETING BUT WERE TOLD THAT IN PRINCIPAL IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE IF CHANGES WERE MADE.

WITH REGARD TO THE APPLICATION FOR THE NEW HOUSE WE NOTE THAT SEVERAL TREES HAVE BEEN REMOVED AND TOPPED AND THE SITE HAD A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER SERVED ON IT BUT THE TREES WERE REMOVED AND TOPPED RECENTLY. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO US.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS OBJECTION WILL BE REINFORCED BY AN INTIMATION WITH MORE OBJECTIONS RELATING TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RELATING TO PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS , SUPERIOR TITTLE AGAINST DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE AND BACKGROUND INFO.

YOURS FAITHFULLY,
DOUGLAS ARMSTRONG

19TH SEPTEMBER 2013

CAN YOU PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS EMAIL TO 