



QUEEN'S CROSS HARLAW COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Founded April 1987

Andrew H.R. Goldie,
276 Union Grove,
Aberdeen AB10 6TQ
2nd April 2012

Tel.:

Mr Matthew Easton,
Planning and Sustainable Development,
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen, AB10 1AB

Application 140259: Exterior Developments to The Chester Hotel.

Dear Mr Easton,

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 plans for the rear of the property, specifically with the proposal for an elevated pergola with associated outdoor seating. We have no objections to the plans for development of the hotel frontage.

What is proposed for the rear of the hotel is in effect, a Beer Garden; and problems arise due to the proximity to private housing on Harlaw Road, and from the proposed access from Queen's Lane South. Our comments are as follows:-

1. Beer Gardens, especially where revelry is involved, generate a fair amount of noise; and when emanating from an elevated position, such noise can carry a considerable distance. In this instance, and due to the close proximity of the rear gardens of the Harlaw Road properties, the noise will cause a nuisance and therefore result in a loss of amenity for these properties.
2. Due to the degree of elevation of the proposed development, the beer garden will overlook the rear-gardens of the residencies on Harlaw Road resulting in the loss of a privacy that these properties currently enjoy.

3. While there is some parking provision for the Beer Garden area, there are concerns that inappropriate, over-spill parking will take place in Queen's Lane and elsewhere.
4. The proposed access from Queen's Lane South will inevitably attract pedestrian clientele to the rear of the hotel; yet the lane is inherently unsuitable for this purpose as this section is devoid of footpaths on either side. The resultant mix of pedestrians and additional vehicular traffic on the roadway will result in a hazard to both.

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.

Planning and Sustainable Development

Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

13th May 2014

f.a.o Matthew Easton

Dear Matthew

For the attention of: Mr Matthew Easton

Planning Application ref: 140258 External Works at the Chester Hotel

We write further to a 'recent' letter from Queens Cross Harlaw Community Council, dated 2nd April 2012 (in error we expect), and addressed to your department.

The points noted below seek to address the matters raised in the letter and are noted as follows;

1) Elevated Pergola and Outdoor Seating.

The Pergola structure is constructed from timber beams resting on stone clad columns. The beams are elevated above ground level in order that hotel guests can walk safely below them. The area immediately below the pergola structure is finished in stone slabs. The level of the top of these slabs is about 50mm below the level of the topsoil in the existing adjacent flower borders. Therefore as oppose to being elevated it is actually set down.

2) Outdoor Seating

There are two proposed stone benches each suitable for 2-3 people, one located at each side of the pergola structure. This is the only seating proposed for this area, and it is intended that it would only be used intermittently by less able guests, or guests with disabilities.

3) Beer Garden

The Pergola are is not a beer garden, this is not noted on the planning application nor shown on the drawings, and it is not its intended function.

It is intended that the Pergola be used occasionally for small wedding ceremonies, and to provide a backdrop for taking photographs of brides and bridesmaids. It is for this reason that it has been located in a remote, quiet and secluded area of the garden. Please note that there is no intention to use this area as a beer garden, it is distant from the hotel bars, and is intentionally not connected to any of the other drinking areas, indoors or outdoors.

4) Degree of Elevation

We have today checked the degree of elevation of the Pergola area relative to neighbouring properties. Immediately across the lane, and opposite the Pergola is a garden wall forming the rear wall of a garden shed/garage. Other garden walls in the vicinity are relatively high, and there is no overlooking of adjacent properties in any direction. In addition the Pergola area is screened by tall evergreen shrubs, its own garden wall and a mature deciduous tree with hanging foliage screening the Pergola above wall level. Due to the nature of outdoor weddings and the taking of wedding photographs, it seems highly unlikely that it would be used in winter when foliage on the tree is scant or absent.

5) Car Parking

Users of the Pergola will be bridal parties with photographers. These are not additional guests and therefore the introduction of the Pergola to the hotel grounds will generate no additional vehicular traffic, over and above that already accounted for in previously approved planning applications for the hotel. The rear gate to the hotel car park is to be re-instated on completion of the construction works. To this end the granite gate posts have already been re-built and the former metal gate which had been damaged prior to the onset of the construction works, is being repaired. The current planning consents for the hotel carry a condition that this gate be used for hotel deliveries/collections only, and not by hotel guests. Therefore, it will be locked at all other times. Aside from not generating additional vehicular traffic, planning conditions already state that the rear gate will not be used by guests.

6) Pedestrian Clientele

The comments made under item 5 above also apply to pedestrians. That is, there will be no additional pedestrian traffic generated by the Pergola, and there is not to be access to the hotel from the rear lane. It should be noted that there is in fact an old garden gate in the wall adjacent to the Pergola area. However, this gate is at the wrong level for the garden, and is screwed shut. It is not intended that it be brought back into use as part of the current proposals and in fact, observation of the current planting surrounding the pergola area will confirm this. There are large evergreen shrubs planted in front of the gate, and the pergola construction in any case would hinder pedestrian access from the gate.

It is noted that a site visit is recommended by the Queens Cross Harlaw Community Council. We agree that should any doubt remain regarding the use of the Pergola structure, a site visit would serve to clarify matters in relation to the various points raised above.

Kind regards

Rachel

for and on behalf of Graham Mitchell Architects

encl –

4 Harlaw Road Aberdeen

I wish to make an objection to the planning application 140259 for the following reasons.

1. Noise – I am not objecting to the front seating, but I am objecting to the rear. This is a residential area and we have already had to tolerate the noise from the seating balcony at the Malmaison Hotel which I can hear in my upstairs bedroom.
2. I feel that this also sets a precedent and allows further development to do the same.
3. I see that they have built the pergola which is very presumptuous considering you have not granted them permission.
4. Anti-social behaviour - I assume they propose to allow customers to drink alcohol in the rear this in turn can create the potential for anti social behaviour.
5. I have to question how they obtained planning consent to build a function room to cater for 300 guests considering there are only 20 car parking spaces at the front and with a further 10 proposed, this really does not seem right. I remember when Simpsons Hotel was built, they had to have a certain amount of car parking spaces which took up all the outside space which they have built on, also at the time it was stated that the cars could not use the lane as an exit.

The neighbours have had to tolerate 1 year of disruption during this build. I really do think the planning department need to take into consideration the access when granting planning approval, Queens Lane South is a lane and not a road, Lorries and vans on many occasions have had to reverse up to these hotels as they cannot turn.

Please take consideration of my points.

Regards

Louise Pirie

PI

From: Louise Pirie [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 April 2014 15:56
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: The Chester Hotel - Objection
Attachments: Objection to Chester Hotel 16-4-14.docx

Please find attachment re objection to Chesters hotel Application 140259

Regards

Louise Pirie

4 Harlaw Road Aberdeen

I wish to make an objection to the planning application 140259 for the following reasons.

1. Noise – I am not objecting to the front seating, but I am objecting to the rear. This is a residential area and we have already had to tolerate the noise from the seating balcony at the Malmaison Hotel which I can hear in my upstairs bedroom.
2. I feel that this also sets a precedent and allows further development to do the same.
3. I see that they have built the pergola which is very presumptuous considering you have not granted them permission.
4. Anti-social behaviour - I assume they propose to allow customers to drink alcohol in the rear this in turn can create the potential for anti social behaviour.
5. I have to question how they obtained planning consent to build a function room to cater for 300 guests considering there are only 20 car parking spaces at the front and with a further 10 proposed, this really does not seem right. I remember when Simpsons Hotel was built, they had to have a certain amount of car parking spaces which took up all the outside space which they have built on, also at the time it was stated that the cars could not use the lane as an exit.

The neighbours have had to tolerate 1 year of disruption during this build. I really do think the planning department need to take into consideration the access when granting planning approval, Queens Lane South is a lane and not a road, Lorries and vans on many occasions have had to reverse up to these hotels as they cannot turn.

Please take consideration of my points.

Regards

James Bruce

MEA

PI

From: Louise Pirie [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 April 2014 15:58
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Objection to Chester Hotel Application number 140259
Attachments: Objection to Chester Hotel 16-4-14.docx

Regards

James Bruce

PI

From: Jamie Mathie [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 April 2014 17:23
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Planning Application 140259 - Objection
Attachments: The Chester planning application objection.docx

Dear Mr Easton,

Please find attached my objection letter to the above planning application at The Chester Hotel.

Best Regards

Jamie Mathie
18 Harlaw Road
Aberdeen

18 Harlaw Road
Aberdeen
AB15 4YY
20th April 2014

Planning Reception
Planning and Sustainable Development
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Ref Planning Application No. 140259

Dear Mr Easton,

I am writing to inform you of my objection to part of the above planning application. I have no objection to any development at the front of the property but do have an objection to the proposed development at the rear of the property from a number of points.

1. It is assumed that the seating area will be licensed and as such there will be an increase in the potential for anti-social behaviour. This has been noticed at the Malmaison Hotel where guests have shown little respect to the surrounding properties and there would be nothing to suggest that the situation would be any different at The Chester.
2. There will be an increase in the potential for litter being dropped in Queen's Lane South which The Chester will take no responsibility for when their guests depart their establishment.
3. It is without a doubt a fact that when groups of people gather outside the volume of the conversation increases and this will be further increased when they gather in a social environment while drinking alcohol. With this level of noise in an otherwise residential area the noise will travel to a number of the residential properties that back on to Queen's Lane South.
4. To allow the seating area at the rear of property would result in an increase in pedestrian traffic along Queen's Lane South. This would result in an increase in noise, litter and anti-social behaviour as already discussed above.
5. In addition to the increase in pedestrian traffic there will also be an associated increase in vehicular traffic from patrons visiting The Chester for social events. It is highly likely that the pedestrian and vehicular traffic would be highest when departing The Chester which will be late in the evenings and result in disruption to my children's sleep.
6. Being an outdoor seating area will tend to appeal more to smokers and will add to the litter problems in addition to the unpleasant and unhealthy smoke fumes.

As mentioned above there is already evidence that these points all occur at the Malmaison Hotel and this is only from the balcony at the rear of that property. This proposal will result in significantly

more noise, anti-social behaviour and litter and is not the sort of proposal that should be considered for a residential area.

I would hope that the Planning Committee take these points into consideration and reject the above proposal for seat area at the rear of The Chester Hotel.

Yours Sincerely

Jamie Mathie

P&S Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 140259		
RECEIVED 22 APR 2014		
Nor	Sou	MAP
Case Officer Initials: MCA		
Date Acknowledged: 24-4-14		

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 17 April 2014 13:25
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140259

Comment for Planning Application 140259

Name : Mr Nicol Bradford
Address : 2 Harlaw Place
Aberdeen
AB15 4YW

Telephone :

Email : 

type :

Comment : Please note that I have already sent an objection by email (dated 16/04/14) - the following are supplementary points I would like to make.

What is being proposed for the rear of the hotel is effectively a 'beer-garden'. If that is not originally stated as the intent, then eventually that is what it would become. Due to the reasons put forward in my email (noise, anti-social hours, smoke, disruption, lack of privacy and control) this is an unacceptable development and use of such an area located directly adjacent to family homes. This is not a use that has been permitted previously and is out of character with the particular residential area at the rear.

Additionally, regardless of the proposed rear development for seating etc, the rear of the hotel must not be used by the hotel as an area for customers to drink, smoke or congregate (either approved by the hotel formally or otherwise informally). It is the activity (i.e. the consequent or potential use of the development) that is the problem and not the seat itself. However once the seat/pergola is in place the activity is inevitable.

Thank you again for your consideration.

Nicol.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail (including any attachment to it) is confidential, protected by copyright and may be privileged. The information contained in it should be used for its intended purposes only. If you receive this email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email and do not make use of, disclose or copy it. Whilst we take reasonable precautions to ensure that our emails are free from viruses, we cannot be responsible for any viruses transmitted with this email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

Robert Vickers

From: Bradford, Nicol [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 April 2014 13:26
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Planning Application 140259 (Chester Hotel) - Objection

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to make an objection to the Planning Application 140259 (Chester Hotel) with respect to the proposed development at the rear of the building (seating / pergola) and consequent use of that area by customers of the hotel, for uses other than car parking.

The proposed development (at the rear) will result in the hotel customers using this area as an outdoor extension to the hotel to congregate (potentially with drinks) leading to a very significant increase in noise, smoke and disturbance which will carry over to the neighbouring family houses around the rear of the hotel. This will continue through the day and late into the night - potentially every day, and the hotel staff will have far less control over the behaviour of the customers compared with inside the hotel. The rear area is in view of neighbouring properties and vice versa.

This development is therefore not compatible with the surrounding family housing area, and would significantly reduce the amenity of the neighbours. The rear area of the hotel was not previously used in this particular manner for the entertainment of hotel customers. If approved, any future extension, increase or variation in the use of this area by the hotel for the customers entertainment would be impossible to restrict or control.

Thanks you for your consideration of this objection.

Regards, Mr Nicol Bradford

2 Harlaw Place
Aberdeen, AB15 4YW.
[REDACTED]

NOTE: MY EMAIL ADDRESS HAS CHANGED - PLEASE UPDATE YOUR RECORDS ACCORDINGLY

Talisman Sinopec Energy UK Limited, incorporated in England and Wales (Company number 825828) having its registered office at 20-22 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4JS.

Please follow this link for legal and corporate information on the sender of this email: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

PI

From: Anne Rose [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 April 2014 11:02
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Planning Application Number 140259. Chester Hotel-Objection

Dear Mr Easton

My husband and I are writing with regard to the Planning Application Number 140259 (Chester Hotel) and would like to raise our objection to the proposed seating and pergola tone added to the rear of the hotel.

This area was previously used as a car park and therefore did not encourage an area for congregation of people or emit any significant noise. It did however cause much more traffic in a very quiet, narrow lane. This would change dramatically if this area were to be changed. This area is extremely close to our residential properties and would have a significant adverse impact. Likewise by reducing car parking for the hotel's patrons this will then have an impact on traffic and parking around our homes. This is primarily a residential area and therefore difficult to park as it is.

The back lane is already too narrow and restrictive for the traffic that now uses it.

An area directly near our homes for seating where customers are socialising, carries the risk of much noise (especially evening/ late night), nuisance and anti-social behaviour. This generally affects the amenity of our primarily residential area. These episodes are not 'one off' exceptions but could be throughout the week and especially during the busy weekend period when we are in our homes and gardens. and are entitled to enjoy our privacy and peace.

Furthermore, this proposed outside area, or 'beer garden', can be where patrons congregate to smoke due to restrictions within the hotel itself. It also adds the fact that this will become a magnet for noise. We enjoy currently the peaceful nature of our neighbourhood. Unfortunately noise does carry especially in the evening and late at night as would the smell

of smoke and its impact. Also as we have pointed out this is very likely to antisocial, noisy behavior late at night.

We believe that this added development is contrary to the terms and provisions of the original development plan which ultimately sought to protect amenities for local residents. We have tolerated many developments to the commercial areas around our properties for overall benefit in the longer term but the ongoing impact to our quality of life and avoidance of the issues highlighted above should be considered.

We thank you for your consideration of the issues highlighted above.

Anne and Chris Rose

6, Harlaw Terrace
Aberdeen AB15 4YU

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 140259		
RECEIVED 21 APR 2014		
Nor	Sou	MAp
Case Officer Initials: MGA		
Date Acknowledged: 24-4-14		

PI

From: Susanna Barker [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 April 2014 15:58
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Planning Application Number 140259 - Chester Hotel - Objection.

Dear Mr Easton,

I wish to object to Planning Application no 140259 – Chester Hotel.

The grounds for my objection are thus:-

1. Noise.

Since moving here ten years ago I cannot remember a time when there wasn't building construction of some sort taking place within a short distance from our home. I thought the lane looked a peaceful place to live, and so it should be, but there has been constant disruption and noise, some of it from people doing their own building work, which is fine, but most of it coming from the refurbishment and extension of Malmaison and now the Chester Hotel. Whilst no one begrudges children the right to make noise in the playground, the Hamilton school also became very noisy during the day, with bells ringing, and singing classes etc as well as the general noise of children. This is fine during the day (I expect the school will return in some form) but now we are faced with continual noise from patrons of the hotel, well into the night. This is not acceptable. We live in a residential area and should be allowed to sit in the garden in the evenings and enjoy the birdsong without noisy outbursts of drunken behaviour. It will be even worse for the elderly couple whose property adjoins the hotel.

1. Pedestrian use of the lane.

People who deliberately want to sit out in the back part of the hotel garden will park their cars either in Queen's Lane South or Harlaw Road. This means there will be people walking back to their cars past our homes. Whilst I am sure the majority will be well behaved, I am equally sure that a handful will be a nuisance. People don't consider others when they are intoxicated and I would not be surprised to find people wandering around our garden and our neighbour's garden, either looking for mischief, or for somewhere to relieve themselves. Either way they are not likely to do it quietly.

1. Car parking

The extension to the Chester Hotel is very large. No one can convince me that there will be enough car parking spaces within the complex. There simply isn't the room. When Simpsons hosted conferences the cars parked in the lane and beyond because the hotel could not provide enough car parking spaces. This means that patrons will park in Queen's Lane South or Harlaw Road. This is a safety hazard. The fire brigade, or indeed an ambulance if ever needed, would not be able to get appropriate access to adjacent properties. We do not possess a driveway or garage for our own car and have to park in Harlaw Road ...the lane is too narrow to park safely. It already happens that on days when there are matches taking place on Harlaw Playing fields, we

cannot park near our house and have to park some distance away. How much worse is it going to be when patrons of the hotel park there too?

1. General inconvenience.

There will be a rise in the amount of litter in the lane, some of which will end up blown, or thrown into our gardens. Who will clear this away? The hotel management will not consider it within their remit to clear or clean anywhere outside their own boundaries. This is unacceptable for local residents.

Lastly, and on a more personal level, I am not happy about the light pollution. My partner is an astro-photographer and whilst it is frustrating to have to work against the background light pollution of the street lamps etc, if the hotel decides to use flood lights, taking any pictures of the night sky will become impossible. I know this is a more personal matter, but why should someone's lifestyle be disrupted so that others can drink. They can drink anywhere in the town. My partner only has his back garden in which to pursue his hobby. I am sure small lights would be acceptable, but please, if this goes ahead, no floodlights.

I agree with all the points that Mr Vorenkamp has cited. Please give due consideration to these as they are not unreasonable.

Yours Sincerely,

Susanna Landais

97, Queen's Lane South

Aberdeen

AB15 4BF.

P&SD Letters of Rerepresentation		
Application Number: 140259		
RECEIVED 22 APR 2014		
Nor	Sou	MAp
Case Officer Initials: MKA		
Date Acknowledged: 24-4-14		

PI

From: ALAN WEST [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 April 2014 00:01
To: PI
Subject: Fw: Planning application Number 140259

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: ALAN WEST [REDACTED]
To: MatthewEaston
Cc: JenniferStewart [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 21 April 2014, 23:51
Subject: Planning application Number 140259

Dear Matthew

I hereby object to the above referenced planning application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed seating area at the rear of the hotel will cause disturbance and noise from the people sitting/standing in that area.
2. The seating area to the rear of the hotel will have a new access (marked 'future access' on the plan) which will allow noise to emit from the function room which will cause noise in the outside area and surrounding area.
3. The proposals for the seating area at the front of the hotel will reduce the number of parking places in a hotel that is advertising conference facilities for up to 500 delegates (see previous email). I have made this point to you many times and you assured me that most people would be arriving by aeroplane and taxi - this will not plainly not be the case. I request that before any further erosion of the available parking is allowed a new traffic assessment is carried out taking account of the advertised 500 delegate capacity, and assuming that they do not all arrive by aeroplane and taxi.
4. It is also noted that there is a reduction in the number of parking places near the rear gate.

Overall, this sets an undesirable precedent in a residential area.

If this application is approved it is likely that it will result in pedestrian traffic in the rear lane and potentially anti-social behaviour (urination, shouting, litter, smoking odours etc).

We have suffered for over a year with noise outwith the allowed times, mud in the lane and blocked garage on regular occasions during the building of this hotel and the work should be completed before any further work is allowed to commence. If this application is approved the current nuisance of the construction noise will be replaced by the noise of people in the rear outside seating area only it will be late at night and every night.

This is creeping development and if allowed will continue for a long time. There is still no control over the rear gate and the current development seems far from finished, despite the statement in your email on the 21st of March. However, the pergola that has no planning permission has been completed.

Overall this is further over-development of the site and I object to this application.

Best regards

Alan West
26 Harlaw Road
Aberdeen
AB15 4YY

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 140259		
RECEIVED 22 APR 2014		
Nor	Sou	MAp
Case Officer Initials: MKA		
Date Acknowledge: 24-4-14		

From: Isobel Vorenkamp [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 April 2014 12:22
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application number 140259 Chester Hotel - Objection

Dear Mr Easton

I wish to object to Planning Application no. 140259.

We have no problem with the seating at the front of the hotel.
However, we do object to the proposed seating area to the rear of the hotel.
Our objection is based upon the following grounds:

1. This proposal would create an undesirable precedent in an area that is immediately adjacent to residential property.

To date, the development model of commercial properties on Queen's Road backing onto Queen's Lane South has so far been that of a car park to the rear backing on to the lane. This has resulted in a large increase vehicle traffic but relatively little pedestrian traffic.

This proposal is based on an entirely different model. It is proposed that the area to the rear of the hotel will be used partially at least as a seating area.

The hotel property has very limited parking. It stands to reason that patrons of this open seating area will frequently leave by walking along Queen's Lane South.

This will inevitably increase pedestrian traffic in Queen's Lane South with all the ensuing problems that we have itemised below in points 2, 3 and 4.

2. Anti-social behaviour

I am assuming that the seating area will be licensed for serving alcohol.

It would create the potential for anti-social behaviour on the part of the patrons of this outdoor seating area

There is a general dis-inhibition by people gathering in an outdoor setting where alcohol is available.

There is a sense of anonymity relating to their surroundings and they do not observe the same general code of respectful behaviour as that of neighbours in their own back gardens.

3. Noise carrying

It would create a noise carrying situation, as people gathered in a group outdoors tend to speak over one another and the volume increases and the noise carries in the open air. It is impossible to regulate the decibel level in this situation.

4. Litter

The problem of litter will be increased by litter both blowing from the outdoor seating area into the lane and also dropped by patrons walking down the lane on their way home. Of course in the hotel's own interest it will sweep up in their own seating area. However, the hotel will neither manage or rectify the increased litter dropped by their patrons having left this outdoor area.

5. Traffic Increase

There will be a huge increase in pedestrian traffic in Queen's Lane South. Pedestrian traffic will naturally flow into Queen's Lane with people leaving the outdoor seating area at the rear of the hotel. It is reasonable to suggest that this will not necessarily be done in a quiet fashion. No guarantee can be given that these customers will give due consideration to the amenities of the residents of private homes as they use Queen's Lane South as a thoroughfare at varying times of day and night.

Our points 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 will equally apply to the pedestrian traffic in the lane.

6. Smoking

Smokers gravitate to outdoor seating areas. This results in unpleasant odours and the inevitable litter of cigarette ends.

Regards
Isobel Vorenkamp
24 Harlaw Road
AB15 4YY

P&SD Letters of Representation	
Application Number:	140259
RECEIVED	11 APR 2014
Nor	MAp
Case Officer Initials:	MEA
Date Acknowledged:	15/4/14

Robert Vickers

From: Mark Vorenkamp [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 April 2014 11:47
To: PI
Cc: Jennifer Stewart
Subject: Planning Application number 140259 Chester Hotel - Objection

Dear Mr Easton

I wish to object to Planning Application no. 140259.

We have no problem with the seating at the front of the hotel.
However, we do object to the proposed seating area to the rear of the hotel.
Our objection is based upon the following grounds:

1. This proposal would create an undesirable precedent in an area that is immediately adjacent to residential property.

To date, the development model of commercial properties on Queen's Road backing onto QLS has so far been that of a car park to the rear backing on to the lane. This has resulted in a large increase vehicle traffic but relatively little pedestrian traffic.

This proposal is based on an entirely different model. It is proposed that the area to the rear of the hotel will be used partially at least as a seating area.

The hotel property has very limited parking. It stands to reason that patrons of this open seating area will frequently leave by walking along Queen's Lane South.

This will inevitably increase pedestrian traffic in Queen's Lane South with all the ensuing problems that we have itemised below in points 2, 3 and 4.

2. Anti-social behaviour

I am assuming that the seating area will be licensed for serving alcohol.

It would create the potential for anti-social behaviour on the part of the patrons of this outdoor seating area. There is a general dis-inhibition by people gathering in an outdoor setting where alcohol is available. There is a sense of anonymity relating to their surroundings and they do not observe the same general code of respectful behaviour as that of neighbours in their own back gardens.

3. Noise carrying

It would create a noise carrying situation, as people gathered in a group outdoors tend to speak over one another and the volume increases and the noise carries in the open air. It is impossible to regulate the decibel level in this situation.

4. Litter

The problem of litter will be increased by litter both blowing from the outdoor seating area into the lane and also dropped by patrons walking down the lane on their way home. Of course in the hotel's own interest it will sweep up in their own seating area. However, the hotel will neither manage or rectify the increased litter dropped by their patrons having left this outdoor area.

5. Traffic Increase

There will be a huge increase in pedestrian traffic in Queen's Lane South. Pedestrian traffic will naturally flow into Queen's Lane with people leaving the outdoor seating area at the rear of the hotel. It is reasonable to suggest that this will not necessarily be done in a quiet fashion. No guarantee can be given that these customers will give due consideration to the amenities of the residents of private homes as they use Queen's Lane South as a thoroughfare at varying times of day and night.

Our points 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 will equally apply to the pedestrian traffic in the lane.

6. Smoking

Smokers gravitate to outdoor seating areas. This results in unpleasant odours and the inevitable litter of cigarette ends.

As an addendum; I would like to mention that we have already experienced considerable amount of noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour with respect to the balconies at the rear of of Malmaison which overlook Queen's Lane South and our home.

We have had to call Malmaison on several occasions and request that they ask customers on the balcony to keep the noise down and failing that ask them to vacate the balcony. This has, on each occasion, had an unsatisfactory outcome. People paying for drinks in a commercial establishment do not appreciate being asked to keep reasonably quiet and in fact such a request tends to inflame the situation. In my experience with the Malmaison this has resulted in an increase of noise from the balcony followed by groups of people strolling up and down the lane singing and shouting as a retort. These events have taken place during both daytime and evenings and are obviously out of the control of Malmaison. However, the problem has come into existence by the creation of an outdoor drinking area adjacent to residential property. Two small balconies are on a much smaller scale than the prospect of an entire outdoor licensed seating area. I feel it would be inappropriate and disingenuous for Planning to suggest that such a situation could exist without a significant reduction to the amenities of the local residents. You would be granting approval for a development that creates a potential nuisance for residents that cannot be controlled. Is this development something the members of the Planning Committee would want at the end of their back garden?

We have lived here since 1980. We seen many commercial developments which have affected our amenity with never - ending construction, noise nuisance, weekend working etc. We have however, never objected to any proposals for development in the past. This proposal would however, present the residents surrounding it with a permanent potential nuisance which should not be granted.

Regards
Mark Vorenkamp
24 Harlaw Road
AB15 4YY

P&SD Letters of Representation	
Application Number:	140259
RECEIVED	11 APR 2014
NO	Sou
	MAp
Date of receipt	ME A
Date of receipt	15/4/14

140259

95 Queens lane ^{MEF} Sth
Aberdeen
AB15 4BF

Town and County Planning
(Development Management Procedure)
Aberdeen City Council
Planning and Sustainable Development.
Mauschal College
Broad Street.
Aberdeen.
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir/Madam

I am truly disappointed at the retrospective nature of planning permission for a hedous concrete pergola and the continued abuse and deterioration of the residential nature of our area. For the past six months we (through no choice of our own) have lived in a building site. The large plant vehicles continually knocking against our wall, thoughtless parking (photographic evidence available) and loud work starting before 8:00 a.m. caused a deterioration of our living standards.

Having finally arrived at the end of construction we now find since the Hotel opened that the noise from the Hotel, music and voices, is extremely noisy - late into the evening. The pergola, moulded in concrete, is an eyesore. It has been placed at

the diagonally furthest point from the ~~restaurant~~ Hotel at the back of the car park. It is nearer my home than the hotel and we envisage it will be used in the light summer evenings and will be a noise pollution issue.

As I have ^{said} on previous planning objections, the problem of traffic flow and size of lorries are totally unsuitable for the lane and I must again ask you to look at this seriously.

I therefore strongly oppose any further work to the rear of the building.

Yours faithfully

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 140259		
RECEIVED - 4 APR 2014		
Nor	Sou	MAp
Case Officer Initials: MEA		
Date Acknowledged: 7-4-14		