



QUEEN'S CROSS HARLAW COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Founded April 1987

Andrew H.R. Goldie,
276 Union Grove,
Aberdeen AB10 6TQ
13th May 2012

Tel.: [REDACTED]

Ms Jacqui Thain,
Planning and Sustainable Development,
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen, AB10 1AB

Application 140515: Private Parking in Rear Garden of 13/15 Devonshire Road.

Dear Ms Thain,

Following inspection of the plans for the above, and in response to approaches from local residents, I am writing on behalf of Queen's Cross & Harlaw Community Council to object to the above proposal. The grounds of concern relate to the sacrificial loss of part of a shared garden area to allow the introduction of private off-road parking, with subsequent loss of amenity. The gardens of the property are shared between numbers 13 and 15 (the upper flat) Devonshire Road; and the current application is from the absentee owner of number 13 who proposes the unilateral conversion of half of the rear garden into a car-park.

Our comments are as follows:-

1. In common with the other properties (shared or otherwise) in Devonshire Road, the rear gardens are a feature providing a major area for recreation and relaxation; and in the current instance, they also provide a safe play area for young children. The loss of half of the garden to car parking would be a major loss of amenity for both properties; and in the case of number 15, this would be a loss of amenity with no compensating benefit i.e. private parking.
2. While there are examples of partial conversions of rear gardens to parking in the area (e.g. in Union Grove), in all known cases this has been undertaken as a joint-venture, with the full agreement of all owners. No such agreement

exists for the current proposal; and indeed, no form of consultation has taken place between the owners.

3. If granted consent, this planning application will introduce the hazards of traffic manoeuvring in a confined space to an area currently safe for recreation and play. It will also introduce traffic fumes and noise (from car engines and car-doors) which will result in a further loss of amenity for both properties.
4. The granting of consent for this application would set a precedent for other properties in Devonshire Road, and would further undermine and erode the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

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,

Andrew Goldie

Planning Convenor,
Queen's Cross & Harlaw Community Council.

Robert Vickers

P140515 JTH

From: jane jones [redacted]
Sent: 03 May 2014 10:31
To: PI
Subject: Planning application 140515
Attachments: Objections to planning application.docx

I am attaching our comments on this application. Please confirm that you have received them.

Jane and David Jones
15 Devonshire Road
Aberdeen
AB10 6XN

Sent from Windows Mail

We are the owner occupiers of the upper flat 15 Devonshire Road.

We object to Planning Application No 140515 for the following reasons:

- Building these parking spaces in the shared garden at 13/15 Devonshire road will cause a conflict with and a nuisance to our enjoyment of our existing residential amenity, contrary to Policy H1. Two beautiful flower beds will be destroyed to make an ugly hard standing and cars driving into the garden will cause noise and exhaust fumes.
- We believe there is no precedent in the area for building such a parking space in the shared garden of a two-flatted property. There are properties in Union Grove where the rear garden has been made into a car park, but these were neglected gardens where properties comprise many flats occupied by short term tenants. Our property has been a family home for 20 years during which time we have tended all parts of the garden, this being a large part of our leisure time enjoyment and this garden is an important amenity feature of our property. The multi-occupancy tenements in Union Grove are of an entirely different character and therefore not comparable.
- The proposed car park encroaches nearer the house than the building line of existing garages in neighbouring back gardens and as such is overdevelopment which will dominate the garden area.
- The owners who have submitted the application are non resident and their property is for them an investment where financial considerations dominate ; the plan seems to be a cheap alternative to a garage with the purpose of maximising their rental profits, while damaging the environment of the garden for residents.
- There is no room for cars to turn in the space allowed, so that cars coming through the gate in to the garden must be reversed, so that they do not have to reverse out in to the lane which would be unsafe. This will be very dangerous for any small children in the garden and occupants of both flats will effectively lose the use of what is now a safe enclosed garden. The present tenants of the ground floor flat have small children; the access they (and any other children living in or visiting either property) have now to a safe, quiet, unpolluted open space for leisure and recreation will be compromised. This is contrary to Policy D2.
- We note from the Roads Projects' observations that the development must not drain into the lane, and we are concerned that drainage within the garden will result in an unhealthy environment for people and plants. We question whether the proposed surface water drainage arrangements will be adequate.
- There is no doubt that there will be greater congestion in what is already a very busy lane when two more cars are coming and going. There is permitted parking in the lane at weekends and this will be further restricted to allow access to the gate.
- We do not think that allowing more parking spaces to be built is in line with the Policy D3 to minimise travel by private car. Any future residents of this lower flat will be encouraged and enabled to have two cars, adding to the existing problems of car use, carbon emissions and congestion in the city. It will create a precedent for many other applications in the future which may further exacerbate the problem.

Deleted: I

Deleted: my

Deleted: my

Deleted:

Deleted: I

Deleted: without the agreement of the other garden user

Deleted: gardens attached to

Deleted: are divided into

Deleted: I

Deleted: my

Deleted: comes towards

Deleted: further

Deleted: and change the character of the amenity

Deleted: I

Deleted: may

Deleted: I am

Deleted: the

Deleted: of this part of

Deleted: be adversely affected

Deleted: ing

Deleted: at the sides of

Deleted: I

Deleted: Council's p

Deleted: reduce car use, carbon emissions and congestion in the city