

██████████
██████████
28th August 2013

Tel.: ██████████

Mr Gavin Clark,
Planning and Sustainable Development,
Aberdeen City Council
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen, AB10 1AB

Application 131045: Proposal for 3-Storey Residence at 58 Whitehall Place.

Dear Mr Clark,

I am writing on behalf of Queen's Cross & Harlaw Community Council in connection with the above proposal. The site lies on the boundary between our Community Council and adjacent Rosemount and Mile-End Community Council; and we are writing in response to concerns expressed to us by residents on both sides of the boundary.

Following careful consideration of this planning application within the Community Council, we consider the proposal to be unsatisfactory in a number of areas, and wish to register objection accordingly.

Our comments are summarised as follows:-

1. What is proposed is a three-storey building in an ultra-modern, flat-roof design, finished in modern materials such as zinc and glass. While we welcome modern design and materials in a suitable setting, we are of the view that what is proposed would provide a stark, visual clash in this particular location where the other buildings in the street conform to traditional pitched-roof designs and are finished in traditional materials. In short, what is proposed would be incongruous in terms of architectural style and materials, and would impair the visual amenity of the area.
2. The foot-print of the proposed building would clearly exceed the recommended plot-ratio limits (33%) by a considerable margin, and we

therefore consider the proposal to be a gross over-development of this particular site.

3. There are serious issues of over-looking and privacy with this planning application. The proposed build would over-look the adjacent residence (no. 58A) resulting in a loss of privacy in both the master bedroom and private rear garden of the neighbouring property. This is unacceptable.
4. We agree with the comments of the Roads Development Control Engineer; namely, that provision of further, lowered-pavement vehicular access, in addition to existing access, would cause a safety hazard to pedestrians. We also agree that the resultant loss of existing on-street parking would have a further adverse impact on local amenity.
5. Our understanding is that this development would involve the splitting of a feu and the sub-division and redevelopment of a residential curtilage. Our understanding of policy relating to such matters (as documented in Supplementary Guidance to the adopted Aberdeen City Local Development Plan) is that in such circumstances, a presumption against the granting of planning approval will apply. The application should therefore be refused as a matter of policy.

The above is a fair reflection of the views of Queen's Cross and Harlaw Community Council, and we trust that you will give our comments due weight in the determination of this application. We are of the firm belief that this planning application should be rejected for the reasons outlined above. Should Committee Members feel in any way inclined to doubt our assessment however, then we recommend that a site visit be undertaken to resolve matters.

Should you require clarification on any of the above points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Planning Convenor,

Queen's Cross & Harlaw Community Council.

P&SD Letters of Representation	
Application Number:	131045
RECEIVED	- 2 SEP 2013
Ncr	Sou MAp
Case Officer Initials:	GAC
Date Acknowledged:	3/09/13.

58A Whitehall Place,
Aberdeen,
AB25 2PJ.

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

21st August 2013

Dear Sir,

Letter of representation against the proposal to build a new house and demolish the garage at 58 Whitehall Place, Aberdeen - Application Number 131045:

We acknowledge receipt of the Notice, application number 131045, served on us as notifiable neighbours in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008. Having viewed the drawings submitted by the applicant's architects, we have concerns that the proposals fail to comply with the Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan and the criteria against which the application should be assessed.

- 1) Contrary to 3.5 of the Guidance, a rear window to an open plan 2nd floor bedroom will look directly over and into the private amenity space which is our garden behind 58A Whitehall Place.
- 2) Contrary to 3.7 of the Guidance, the depth of rear garden afforded by the proposed design falls significantly below the 11 metres specified as that required for a house of more than 2 storeys. According to the proposed site layout plan, the depth even fails to meet the minimum of 9 metres required for a 2 storey dwelling.
- 3) Because of the size of the proposed development and the limited area of the site being acquired by the developer, the percentage of the site proposed to be built-on will be nearer 42% than the 33% restriction quoted in 5.2 of the Supplementary Guidance.

We should also like to make representations that the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on road safety and on-street car parking. As stated in the comments from Roads Development Control as a Statutory Consultee, increasing the number of consecutive pavement crossings to three will create more hazardous conditions for pedestrians, greatly increasing the risk of conflict between them and vehicles manoeuvring to enter or leave driveways. The addition of another house in this position will also increase the likelihood of vehicles exiting the 2 existing driveways, not being able to manoeuvre to the side and having to potentially reverse directly out into

the often very busy Whitehall Place. In the 8 years we have lived here, it is noticeable how much more traffic utilises this street as an alternative to Carden Place, to travel in and out of town and to drop off and pick up children at nearby schools.

Again, to the detriment of local amenity, the loss of another two on-street parking spaces in order to create a pavement crossing would have a significant effect on the already under pressure parking opportunities. This has also been negatively commented on by the Engineer from Roads Development Control.


From an aesthetic standpoint, we object strongly to the proposed development firstly on the grounds that the proposals are starkly different from the style of houses existing in this part of Whitehall Place and detrimental to the character of the area. The proposed design utilises the materials, zinc, smooth polymer render, polished granite and glass in a curtain walling context. All of these finishes are alien to this street and utilised in the form indicated by the proposed elevations, diminish any style and character the existing properties have.

Because of its flat roofed form, the proposed design doesn't complement and contrast the traditional 30 and 35 degree pitched roofs of the other houses in the street. It ignores them and far from acting as a "bookend" to the 3 house terrace it would create, as described in the designer's Design Statement, it would spoil a perfectly acceptable city-scape.

We also have concerns that the height of the proposed structure exceeds the height of the ridge of the properties at 58A and 60 Whitehall Place which is contrary to the Supplementary Guidance to the Local Development Plan and the massing of the building by virtue of its stepped flat roof form, creates a visual barrier to the existing roofscape as one looks West from Albert Street.

On a site elsewhere, as part of a terrace of similarly designed properties utilising these modern materials and forms, I would applaud the design but my wife and I feel the design is wholly inappropriate in this location.

Yours faithfully,

A large rectangular area of the document is completely blacked out, redacting the names and any handwritten notes of the signatories.

Derek and Fiona McWilliam.

Robert Vickers

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 August 2013 14:28
To: PI
Subject: Planning Application 131045

M Stuart
52 Queens Highlands
Aberdeen
AB15 4AR

RE : PLANNING APPLICATION 58 WHITEHALL PLACE, ABERDEEN - Reference Number 131045

As a resident of the west end of Aberdeen and a person brought up in Osborne Place, I should like to object to the application for Planning Permission to demolish a garage and build a 3 storey town house in the garden of 58 Whitehall Place. The style of house proposed is totally out of character and alien to the existing residential landscape of traditional pitched roofed houses. It is flat roofed and employs materials not echoed anywhere else in the street and ignores existing styles. It conflicts with the Council's guide to the Local Development Plan in terms of rear garden size and plot ratio and surely must be regarded as overdevelopment of the site. I object to the proposed development in the strongest terms.

Regards,

Moray Stuart
Senior Architectural Technologist
Property
Transportation & Infrastructure
Woodhill House
Westburn Road
Aberdeen AB16 5GB

[REDACTED]
* [REDACTED]
; www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk

This e-mail may contain privileged information intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender, deleting the e-mail afterwards. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the e-mail's author and do not necessarily represent those of Aberdeenshire Council.

www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk

Robert Vickers

From: Alexander McPherson [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 August 2013 16:14
To: PI
Subject: 58 Whitehall Place Planning Application

Reference Number 131045:

Application for Planning Permission to Demolish a Garage and Build a New House in the Garden of 58 WHITEHALL PLACE, ABERDEEN -

Although I live in Cottage Brae, I was brought up in the Albert Street area and spent my childhood around Craigie Loanings and Whitehall Place. I have visited the Planning website and looked at the proposals for the above new house. I would be very sorry to see such different and visually awkward building built in this area of mostly traditionally built houses and tenements. This monstrosity owes nothing to the styles and materials of the existing properties. It ignores all the pitched roofed houses and spoils the continuity of that side of Whitehall Place by virtue of it being flat roofed and clad in zinc! It is totally inappropriate for the proposed site and in my opinion looks too big for the area of land indicated in the site layout plan. Are you sure it complies with the Local Development Plan? There must be issues regarding privacy and light which make the building unacceptable in such close proximity to the existing house at 58A. I notice the proposal includes a terrace at 2nd floor level. Surely this is unacceptable when the roof windows of the existing house are so close?

From the parking point of view, I would imagine the already difficult parking problem will be detrimentally affected as more parking spaces are sacrificed to provide yet another pavement crossing. I would also be concerned for the safety of children and elderly people because they already run the gauntlet of cars arriving and leaving from the drives of existing houses. Another house will increase the likelihood of an accident.

I object to the proposed application in the strongest terms and would insist the Planning Officers consider my representations in their assessment of the submitted designs.

Sandy McPherson
3 Cottage Brae
Aberdeen
AB10 6DG

Robert Vickers

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of Nick NA
[REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2013 14:12
To: PI; gaclark@aberdeenvity.gov.uk
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Objection to Planning Application at 58 Whitehall Place Aberdeen

131045

To whom this may concern,

I wish to express my opposition to this planning application. I feel it is not appropriate to carry out such work in the area, and will lead to both a shortage of parking spaces and an increase in traffic, in addition to being an increased risk to pedestrians - particularly children from the local school.

As a resident with a private car park, I am concerned that surrounding buildings would find themselves using our car park without permission. We only have a very limited number of spaces as things currently stand, and to introduce another large number of vehicles to the area would be detrimental in this respect. There are barely enough on-street spaces to accommodate those living in the area at present, so I feel it is a legitimate concern that there would not be sufficient space and this may spill over and affect our building.

Due to Whitehall Place serving place for a school, and being a morning route into town from Queens Cross, I feel the construction would result in an irreversible increase in traffic both during the build period and beyond. I selected this location for my flat because it is generally a quiet area - with regard to both noise and traffic level - but I strongly believe the outlined project would hugely compromise this.

Please take my and other local residents' concerns into consideration. I do not feel this project would bring any value to the area, and hope that you can understand and appreciate my reasons for objecting.

Kind regards,

Nick Atkinson
77C Whitehall Place

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 04 August 2013 20:47
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131045

Comment for Planning Application 131045

Name : Derek McWilliam
Address : 58A Whitehall Place
Aberdeen
AB25 2PJ

Telephone : [REDACTED]
Email : [REDACTED]
type :

Comment : My wife and I have been on holiday and have only recently received the Planning Notice in connection with the proposed development. I will submit our formal objections to these proposals before the expiry of the statutory period but I must make you aware immediately that the address of the proposed development is incorrectly recorded in the Planning Application as 58A Whitehall Place. That is the address of our home, determined by Aberdeen City Council 10 years ago when our house was completed. The use of 58A as the address by the applicant's agent has confused neighbours who have assumed that I am the applicant and am applying to extend our house. Firstly does this invalidate the application and secondly can I insist the neighbour notification process be redone so that all those notified are fully aware of the significance of the proposed development and that this is a substantial new property by a property developer and not an extension to our house?

Planning & Sustainable Development	
Mail ID	29476
RECEIVED	- 6 AUG 2013
REPLY	06 / 08 / 13
Section	AS7
Officer	DR

PI

From: scott warrander [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2013 12:54
To: PI
Subject: Planning Application Reference Number 131045

Planning Application Reference Number 131045: The demolition of a garage and the construction of a new house at 58 Whitehall Place Aberdeen.

Dear Sir,

I would like to object to the application for Planning Permission for a new house at 58 Whitehall Place. I know this area of Aberdeen very well having lived close-by as a student. Although not grand, the properties in this area have a charm that would be spoilt by the addition of such a garishly modern building. The fact that it has no pitched roof seems to cause it to clash with the existing buildings and whilst contrast is not necessarily a bad thing, this proposed design is not sympathetic at all and seems to offend the functional simplicity of the houses nearby. I am a Building Surveyor and totally familiar with Architects' drawings. I have examined the proposed site layout plan and compared proposals to your own Council's Guidance to the Local Development Plan. I would say the proposals fail to comply in that the rear garden is too small. I can appreciate where a larger front garden can be provided that a compromise can be agreed but the site indicated is so small that the plot ratio of 33% cannot be met. The proposal must I would assume, be regarded as overdevelopment of the site.

I see from the drawings particularly the cross sections that the design incorporates a terrace at 2nd floor level. This would cause a serious loss of privacy to the family living next door, since their roof windows are less than two metres away from the edge of this terrace. There would also be a shading of their rear garden and overlooking from the upper windows of the proposed building. This again, is contrary to your own guidance!

Apart from these serious issues, the addition of this building and its pavement crossing access would reduce on-street parking in an area where demand is high. It would also increase the risk to pedestrians who use this pavement in great numbers. There is a large elderly population in this area and this street is used by large numbers of pupils travelling to the Grammar School, located along the street. I notice in the comments from Roads that they are content that 2 off street parking spaces are being provided. I do not feel that 2 cars can be parked in this site whilst still providing safe access to the front door. A wheelchair will not pass between two cars of an average size placed in the drive of this proposed house. I also notice Roads have reservations about the addition of another pavement crossing on the grounds of pedestrian safety!

In conclusion, I object to the proposals for the reasons I have given and I would like my comments taken into account in Planning's consideration of the application.

Regards,

Scott Warrander

Robert Vickers

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 20 August 2013 10:13
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131045

Comment for Planning Application 131045

Name : Neil Casey
Address : Ground floor right
67 Whitehall Place
AB25 2PD

Telephone :

Email : 

type :

Comment : I object to planning application 131045 on the grounds of safety - both entering and leaving the proposed site will be a risk to oncoming traffic - and also parking. The street is also very limited on parking spaces for residents.

Robert Vickers

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 August 2013 15:26
To: PI
Subject: Planning Objection

Application for Planning Permission to Demolish a Garage and Build a New House in the Garden of 58 WHITEHALL PLACE, ABERDEEN - Reference Number 131045:

As a resident of the Aberdeen, I wish to object to the proposal to build a house in the garden of 58 Whitehall Place. In my opinion the site is too small and building a 3 storey house of the type shown in the Planning website is detrimental to the overall appearance of the street. In another location amongst equally modern housing, the design might sit nicely but certainly not here. I feel sorry for the people who live next to this property as they will suffer loss of privacy and definitely shading of their garden as the new house is bigger than the property it will abut. The addition of another house will also make it more dangerous for the school children and elderly of the area to use the pavement in this area as yet more cars struggle out on to the very busy Whitehall Place. I've also had a look at the Local Development Plan and I am pretty sure that these proposals are contrary to both the plot ratio figure of 33% and the minimum rear garden figure of 11 metres. This must be overdevelopment of the site.

I therefore object strongly to the proposals submitted for Planning Permission.

Regards,

Mike Bruce
Senior Quantity Surveyor Technician
Property & Facilities Management
Infrastructure Services
Aberdeenshire Council

Mon, Tue, Fri

Tel: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]
www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk

This e-mail may contain privileged information intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please accept our apologies and notify the sender, deleting the e-mail afterwards. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the e-mail's author and do not necessarily represent those of Aberdeenshire Council.

www.aberdeenshire.gov.uk

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 15 August 2013 00:08
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131045

Comment for Planning Application 131045

Name : Dr Richard Taylor
Address : 60 Whitehall Place
ABERDEEN
AB25 2PJ

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Having considered the plans in detail, we feel that the design of this building is out of keeping with the surrounding properties in terms of materials and symmetry and proportion and regrettably we would like to notify you of our objection to the application as it stands. We object also, that the addition of a property to another two properties of very different style, is wholly detrimental to the overall look and harmony of the buildings as originally constructed. We also regrettably object on the basis that private gardens, driveway conversions of this nature may set a precedent for other applications to develop similar small spaces in existing residential property to be sold for housing or business development in the area.

Robert Vickers

From: karin forrest [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 August 2013 18:01
To: PI
Subject: Rejection of planning application

Dear gavin,

I am writing to you with regards to the planning application at 58 Whitehall place. This application is not in keeping with the area and is an area which is over developed already.

I also have concerns about the height of the building which will overlook all other properties front, back and sides and will take away people's privacy. The balcony will also look into neighbour's gardens, houses and bedrooms which again is a privacy issue to people who have lived in the area for many years.

Finally, the parking in Whitehall place is bad enough without another driveway taking up space. This is also dangerous for reversing out of these driveways as it is a busy road.

I hope you take on board these issues when making a decision.

Karin Forrest
Aberdeen City resident

Sent from Yahoo! Mail on Android

Robert Vickers

From: Fiona McWilliam [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2013 19:17
To: PI
Subject: Planning Application 131045

Dear Mr Clark

I am writing to you about the planning application reference 131045. I am 86 years old and am registered blind. I am also in failing health and frequently have to use a wheelchair which my Occupational Therapist has provided. I have dictated this letter to my daughter as I am unable to see to write anymore.

My family lives in Whitehall Place and often invite me down to their house for meals and to spend time with my grand-children. Parking close enough to the house is often problematic as it is such a busy road, and this makes it difficult for me to gain access easily to my daughter's home. The proposed house will take away more parking spaces, and also make the pavement even more hazardous for me to negotiate, as it would mean three immediately consecutive driveways with cars crossing them to get in and out. There are many elderly people actually living in this road, and the pavements on that side of the street are already quite uneven. I know lots of Robert Gordon's College pupils use this route to school and it would make the pavement even more dangerous for them, too. Even though my vision is limited, the drawing of the proposed house has been shown to me on a large computer screen and I am horrified that such an outlandish design would even be considered in the west end of Aberdeen. It is completely out of keeping and would be more suited to a new build estate or overlooking water - I would not want to be in the flats opposite with someone outside in their balcony looking at me. I therefore submit my objections to you about this development. Many thanks for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Irene Clark,
5C Thomson Street,
Aberdeen.

Robert Vickers

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 26 August 2013 17:28
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 131045

Comment for Planning Application 131045

Name : Maureen Milne
Address : 5 parade Mews
Stocket Parade

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I was looking at the plans for this new development and noticed that the house next to it has been misrepresented. There is no indication on the plan that there are windows in the roof of the adjacent building. The balcony on the proposed new development would be invasive to the privacy of the current owner of the adjacent property. I also believe that the frontage of the building is inconsistent with the area, no other property in the street has a balcony.