

PI

From: Sinclair Laing [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2014 00:13
To: PI
Subject: Fwd: 140823 No documents showing online

Hello

Regarding my last email (forwarded here), planning application ref: 140824 is also not showing online for comments and we make the same requests to have that remedied and the deadline for representations extended.

I'd also like to raise a complaint that these two applications should be one application and not two. They are essentially for one site and the only apparent reason they have been split into applications is to avoid the requirement for wider consultation associated with applications for over 50 homes. That strikes me as a blatant attempt to circumvent due planning requirements and processes.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Best

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sinclair Laing [REDACTED]
Date: 18 July 2014 00:03
Subject: Re: 140823 No documents showing online
To: pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Hello

I'm writing as a representative of the Donside Community Association from Donside Village in Aberdeen. We would like to view and make comment on the planning application 140823. We would like other interested parties to be able to do the same. The final date for representations is 23rd July.

Unfortunately, no-one can view and therefore comment on the application as it is not displayed online. We therefore request that the application is displayed online for interested parties to view and make comments that the date for representations is extended to take account of the fact the application has not been viewable online.

I hope to hear back from you soon.

Best

--
Sinclair Laing
[REDACTED]

If emailing saves time, not printing them saves trees.



PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 01 July 2014 11:03
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140823

Comment for Planning Application 140823

Name : Miss Coleen Ogg
Address : 12 Donside Street
Aberdeen
AB24 2PJ

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : 1 object.

I was sold this property on the basis that no properties would be built in this area next to the river.

Our Block was sold as 'River view'.

The area is beautiful as it is and putting this 8 storey block in next to the river is going to change the complete countryside feel and have a huge downhill impact to the development and area.

It would be greatly appreciated if this can be seriously looked at.

The developer surely cant get away with cramming in as much properties as he can for their financial reward and have this bad an impact on the area.

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.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 28 June 2014 16:40
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140823

Comment for Planning Application 140823

Name : Donna Hughes

Address : 8 Donside Street

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I want to oppose this new build. I bought my flat because of the beautiful big windows in the sitting room that looked out onto the river Don. I now have been told that new flats are going to be built right in front of me! Not only will my view be ruined and therefore what was the point buying a flat with big windows and a view. More importantly flats developed directly in front of my flat now becomes an invasion of privacy. It is quite difficult and a concern to have bigger than average sitting room windows knowing that people in buildings directly across from me have access to view right into my home.

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.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 11 July 2014 20:50
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140824

Comment for Planning Application 140824

Name : Ewa, Marcin Krawczyk

Address : 2 Crosier Courtyard, Donside Village, Aberdeen, AB24 2PP

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : We object to the proposal of residential development of 44 flats over 2 blocks of 7 and 6 storeys. The reasons are: when we were buying our flat, there had been plans of building a park at the river side, some paths and an access to Seaton Park. So it seemed to be nice, green area. At this moment we have got quite nice view through our window - we can see trees in the park which is really lovely, especially that we have got 6 month-old baby. We were happy that he would have the opportunity to grow up in green, quiet area. If you build the blocks, the only view will be huge buildings. Nothing else. If only we knew about such plans, we would not have bought this flat.

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.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 11 July 2014 20:37
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140823

Comment for Planning Application 140823

Name : Steven McDonald
Address : 60 Papermill Avenue
Aberdeen
AB24 2PB

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : 1. It is not in-keeping with the existing look and feel of the development.

1.1. The proposed building is modern, boxy and flat in colour where the rest of the development consists of houses and blocks of flats that vary in height wall colour and roof colour from one building to the next.

In my opinion this is not, as the proposal suggests, to provide contrast; it is only to cater to those who can afford, those who typically desire contemporary styling, minimalism and floor to ceiling glass windows as is evident in every other prohibitively expensive new development in the city.

1.2. It is illogical to position the tallest building in front of the scenic view. You don't put the tallest person at the front of a family photograph and even the 3000 years ago amphitheatres were designed to provide fair and equal views to all.

1.3. I think it highly distasteful that expensive, luxury penthouses will dominate, in size and price, a development that was advertised as being affordable. I also think it is especially disrespectful for an extravagant structure to destroy the view of the one block of flats on the riverside that accommodates tenants in need of affordable rentals almost as if they don't matter.

2. Foxes. A fox den exists on the proposed site. It is in use all year round by the same family with 4 new cubs appearing in the 2 years we have been here. It is disappointing that the border of the conservation area adjacent to the development stops short of protecting wonderful wildlife habitats by mere metres which is why I ask you to still take this into consideration.

3. Misrepresentation and misinformation. When buying our home both sales persons we dealt with, individually and on separate occasions, advertised the development to us as such :

3.1. The development would be environmentally friendly, sustainable and even touch on conservation. We were shown brochures featuring wild flowers and otters yet two years on and the riverside remains a construction site. Now they want to destroy the one corner of wild nature (see 2.) available to the community and replace it with a contradictory monstrosity.

3.2. The proposed building would be identical to the 5 story blocks being erected on the west side of the development and that it was highly probable it would not be granted permission ahead due to the unsuitability of the land.

This was in September 2012 when permission had already been granted and I quote ACCPlanning124564-1.pdf “A subsequent set of planning applications was submitted for the urban square and [sic] surrounding buildings in March 2011 permission being granted in July 2012.

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.

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 140823		
RECEIVED 14 JUL 2014		
Nor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sou	MAp
Case Officer Initials: LCH		
Date Acknowledged: 17/07/2014		

PI

140824

From: Sinclair Laing [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2014 00:13
To: PI
Subject: Fwd: 140823 No documents showing online

Hello

Regarding my last email (forwarded here), planning application ref: 140824 is also not showing online for comments and we make the same requests to have that remedied and the deadline for representations extended.

I'd also like to raise a complaint that these two applications should be one application and not two. They are essentially for one site and the only apparent reason they have been split into applications is to avoid the requirement for wider consultation associated with applications for over 50 homes. That strikes me as a blatant attempt to circumvent due planning requirements and processes.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Best

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Sinclair Laing [REDACTED]
Date: 18 July 2014 00:03
Subject: Re: 140823 No documents showing online
To: pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Hello

I'm writing as a representative of the Donside Community Association from Donside Village in Aberdeen. We would like to view and make comment on the planning application 140823. We would like other interested parties to be able to do the same. The final date for representations is 23rd July.

Unfortunately, no-one can view and therefore comment on the application as it is not displayed online. We therefore request that the application is displayed online for interested parties to view and make comments that the date for representations is extended to take account of the fact the application has not been viewable online.

I hope to hear back from you soon.

Best

--
Sinclair Laing
[REDACTED]

If emailing saves time, not printing them saves trees.



PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 22 July 2014 23:23
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140824

Comment for Planning Application 140824

Name : Donside Community Association
Address : 2 Donside Village Square
Aberdeen
AB24 2PL

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : We, the Donside Community Association (DCA), are writing to submit some specific objections and some supporting comments to the 2 planning applications (refs: 140823 & 140823) comprising 3 blocks of flats at Donside Village in Tillydrone. We have submitted our comments in the form of one statement as we think the issues cross both applications and believe that essentially both applications form one development.

The DCA was set up in February 2013 to act in the best interest of the residents of Donside Village. It's made up of representatives from the Village. These reps take on roles and responsibilities to develop Donside and its community. It aims to act as a voice for Donside at a local level through involvement and engagement with local networks, Community Councils and other partner agencies including the Scottish Police Service, Absafe/Neighbourhood Watch as well as acting as a conduit between the occupants and Tenants First/Sanctuary.

We welcome progression of the development to bring Donside Village towards conclusion. The extended period of on-going development in the village is undoubtedly having a detrimental impact on residents' quality of life - it is affecting the setting, access to amenities, safety, noise and dust / dirt onsite.

Having said that, residents would like the development to be appropriate and be associated with the necessary facilities expected and required for the overall site; as agreed in the original proposals for the site, of which these applications are an amendment.

We are pleased and supportive to note retention of the riverside path as actually following the riverside all the way through the development.

We would enquire as to whether planning gain applies to this development and, if so, request that it is put towards ensuring the riverside path that runs through the development makes quality connections to the rest of the riverside path network that exists on either side of the development.

We are also pleased and supportive to see retention of water access point for paddlers, i.e. kayaks, etc. We believe this is an essential facility for safe recreational access to the river at an urban riverside location.

We welcome the addition of terraces to the proposed flats as we think these were features missing from the original proposals. We also have no objection to the change in orientation to maximise the views of the setting for the new residences.

We acknowledge that the agreed architectural expression for development at this specific location within the site was always to differ from the rest of the village. However, the original agreed proposals still made architectural reference to the rest of the village in order to retain connection to and integrity of the entire development. We do not agree with the suggestion in the Design Statement that a change in orientation of the flats requires a significant deviation from the original architectural expression. It is our opinion that the architectural expression of these new

proposals differs too significantly from what was originally agreed and does not pay enough respect to the integrity of the overall development. We request that this is addressed before the proposals are approved.

We object to the significant under provision of parking associated with the development proposals. The current proposals will result in less than 1 parking space per property – even though each property has at least 2 bedrooms, some 3. This lack of provision will in turn impact on parking elsewhere in the development where current parking arrangements are already not ideal.

We object to the apparent complete lack of provision of cycle parking / storage in the development proposals. These proposals form part of the development of a so-called ‘sustainable community’. As such, cycle parking must be provided. Ideally, that provision should be within a secure and lit bike store within the confines of the blocks themselves, or a secure and lit location very close by. There is an existing cycle store on site at Donside. However, this is already over subscribed, unlit and unsecure – there has been one successful and one attempted break in the past 12 months due to poor security arrangements put in place by the developers.

The new proposals for Block 1 entirely block the strategic view through the development from the roadside at Tillydrone to the river and beyond. While we accept that views are not a material consideration in planning, we do feel this has detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the overall development and request that some of this strategic view across and through the development is retained.

We request that the proposals include an accessible external water tap. The DCA is involved in development and maintenance of the outside spaces in Donside Village. Yet, there are no appropriate facilities to facilitate this. The simple request for the inclusion of an accessible external water tap will help to address this existing shortcoming.

We believe that the original Vision and proposals for Donside Village were inspired and integral. That Vision included a mixed tenure, mixed use, sustainable development with necessary recreational & other facilities. We believe that integrity and delivery of this original is Vision has been undermined and eroded on an on-going basis by the gradual reduction in the quality and number of the actual facilities being delivered on site.

The original proposals agreed and approved included: Recycling facilities, offices, business start up units, 2 retail spaces, a nursery, café and several recreation spaces & facilities for children and young people. To date, only 1 small children’s play area and the office has been delivered – ironically this is the location of the new office for the new site owners. We have not seen any recycling facilities, no café, no retail, no nursery, and no further recreation areas for small children or young adults. And, it is our understanding that there are no plans by the developers to deliver such facilities. We are at a loss to understand how what planners agreed as required facilities to support our sustainable community have managed to drop off the map at the point of delivery. Our concerns are further raised as there is an increase in the numbers of properties in these applications and this will place further need for these facilities to be delivered to support the community with day to day living. We ask that these items are addressed as a matter of urgency. And, we therefore specifically object to the increase in the numbers of properties in these proposals, unless the matter of delivery of the recycling facilities and the recreation areas as agreed in previous proposals is addressed.

Public consultation and engagement – we acknowledge that the developers presented the development proposals to the DCA as stated at the end of the Design Statement. We would question this as meaningful consultation. Presentation of the proposals was not advertised to the members in advance of the meeting. Also, it was more a case of information provision than consultation as there was no defined mechanism for meaningful feedback either during or after the meeting. Had there been a meaningful process of engagement, that may have reduced the need for this degree of comments / objections.

Finally, we express confusion as to the planning process adopted in association with these two planning applications. Why was this, essentially single development proposal, put through as 2 applications - is this a route to circumvent due planning process & associated requirements? Had the development been considered as 1 application, it would have constituted over 50 properties…

Thank you for taking the time to consider our specific comments both in support and objecting to specific aspects of the development proposals. We do hope that any changes can be agreed in a timely manner so that the

development can move forward to conclusion swiftly and the village can finally assume normality and a better quality of life for the existing residents.

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.

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 22 July 2014 23:27
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140823

Comment for Planning Application 140823

Name : Donside Community Association
Address : 2 Donside Village Square
Aberdeen
AB24 2PL

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : We, the Donside Community Association (DCA), are writing to submit some specific objections and some supporting comments to the 2 planning applications (refs: 140823 & 140823) comprising 3 blocks of flats at Donside Village in Tillydrone. We have submitted our comments in the form of one statement as we think the issues cross both applications and believe that essentially both applications form one development.

The DCA was set up in February 2013 to act in the best interest of the residents of Donside Village. It's made up of representatives from the Village. These reps take on roles and responsibilities to develop Donside and its community. It aims to act as a voice for Donside at a local level through involvement and engagement with local networks, Community Councils and other partner agencies including the Scottish Police Service, Absafe/Neighbourhood Watch as well as acting as a conduit between the occupants and Tenants First/Sanctuary.

We welcome progression of the development to bring Donside Village towards conclusion. The extended period of on-going development in the village is undoubtedly having a detrimental impact on residents' quality of life - it is affecting the setting, access to amenities, safety, noise and dust / dirt onsite.

Having said that, residents would like the development to be appropriate and be associated with the necessary facilities expected and required for the overall site & as agreed in the original proposals for the site, of which these applications are an amendment.

We are pleased and supportive to note retention of the riverside path as actually following the riverside all the way through the development.

We would enquire as to whether planning gain applies to this development and, if so, request that it is put towards ensuring the riverside path that runs through the development makes quality connections to the rest of the riverside path network that exists on either side of the development.

We are also pleased and supportive to see retention of water access point for paddlers, i.e. kayaks, etc. We believe this is an essential facility for safe recreational access to the river at an urban riverside location.

We welcome the addition of terraces to the proposed flats as we think these were features missing from the original proposals. We also have no objection to the change in orientation to maximise the views of the setting for the new residences.

We acknowledge that the agreed architectural expression for development at this specific location within the site was always to differ from the rest of the village. However, the original agreed proposals still made architectural reference to the rest of the village in order to retain connection to and integrity of the entire development. We do not agree with the suggestion in the Design Statement that a change in orientation of the flats requires a significant deviation from the original architectural expression. It is our opinion that the architectural expression of these new

proposals differs too significantly from what was originally agreed and does not pay enough respect to the integrity of the overall development. We request that this is addressed before the proposals are approved.

We object to the significant under provision of parking associated with the development proposals. The current proposals will result in less than 1 parking space per property – even though each property has at least 2 bedrooms, some 3. This lack of provision will in turn impact on parking elsewhere in the development where current parking arrangements are already not ideal.

We object to the apparent complete lack of provision of cycle parking / storage in the development proposals. These proposals form part of the development of a so-called –sustainable community–. As such, cycle parking must be provided. Ideally, that provision should be within a secure and lit bike store within the confines of the blocks themselves, or a secure and lit location very close by. There is an existing cycle store on site at Donside. However, this is already over subscribed, unlit and unsecure – there has been one successful and one attempted break in the past 12 months due to poor security arrangements put in place by the developers.

The new proposals for Block 1 entirely block the strategic view through the development from the roadside at Tillydrone to the river and beyond. While we accept that views are not a material consideration in planning, we do feel this has detrimental impact on the landscape setting of the overall development and request that some of this strategic view across and through the development is retained.

We request that the proposals include an accessible external water tap. The DCA is involved in development and maintenance of the outside spaces in Donside Village. Yet, there are no appropriate facilities to facilitate this. The simple request for the inclusion of an accessible external water tap will help to address this existing shortcoming.

We believe that the original Vision and proposals for Donside Village were inspired and integral. That Vision included a mixed tenure, mixed use, sustainable development with necessary recreational & other facilities. We believe that integrity and delivery of this original is Vision has been undermined and eroded on an on-going basis by the gradual reduction in the quality and number of the actual facilities being delivered on site.

The original proposals agreed and approved included: Recycling facilities, offices, business start up units, 2 retail spaces, a nursery, café and several recreation spaces & facilities for children and young people. To date, only 1 small children–s play area and the office has been delivered – ironically this is the location of the new office for the new site owners. We have not seen any recycling facilities, no café, no retail, no nursery, and no further recreation areas for small children or young adults. And, it is our understanding that there are no plans by the developers to deliver such facilities. We are at a loss to understand how what planners agreed as required facilities to support our sustainable community have managed to drop off the map at the point of delivery. Our concerns are further raised as there is an increase in the numbers of properties in these applications and this will place further need for these facilities to be delivered to support the community with day to day living. We ask that these items are addressed as a matter of urgency. And, we therefore specifically object to the increase in the numbers of properties in these proposals, unless the matter of delivery of the recycling facilities and the recreation areas as agreed in previous proposals is addressed.

Public consultation and engagement – we acknowledge that the developers presented the development proposals to the DCA as stated at the end of the Design Statement. We would question this as meaningful consultation. Presentation of the proposals was not advertised to the members in advance of the meeting. Also, it was more a case of information provision than consultation as there was no defined mechanism for meaningful feedback either during or after the meeting. Had there been a meaningful process of engagement, that may have reduced the need for this degree of comments / objections.

Finally, we express confusion as to the planning process adopted in association with these two planning applications. Why was this, essentially single development proposal, put through as 2 applications - is this a route to circumvent due planning process & associated requirements? Had the development been considered as 1 application, it would have constituted over 50 properties…

Thank you for taking the time to consider our specific comments both in support and objecting to specific aspects of the development proposals. We do hope that any changes can be agreed in a timely manner so that the

development can move forward to conclusion swiftly and the village can finally assume normality and a better quality of life for the existing residents.

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.

140823

PI

From: Romany Donald [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 July 2014 13:16
To: PI
Subject: Planning Application

Good Afternoon,

I wish to bring to your attention a new planning permission for three blocks of flats at Donside Village in Aberdeen.

We received this last weekend. The new blocks are huge, 8 storey. None are this size in the whole development. Monstrous buildings which will be executive, for no reason other than to profit. We were told originally that a planned block which was much smaller had been scrapped as the ground was no good, by Chap. This was the reason we chose to move into the area.

The sight for the first block is right on a fox den which has been in use for the last two years, there are cubs.

The whole development is being sold as being eco friendly, but there is nothing eco friendly about this new proposal if it goes ahead. It is so out of character with the rest of the area and we should be encouraging the nature and environment instead of damaging it further.

There is a path which runs along the river which may be compromised if this multi-storey block goes up. Will the path be level with people's windows and will this affect accessibility?

You have already placed a compulsory sale on the roadside at this development in order to widen the road for the new bridge to cross the Don too. This has meant that countless trees have been decimated and a whole eco-system has been destroyed. It has also ruined the look of the whole place. Please do not make this any worse than it is?

Please help, or advise on anything that can be done to stop this awful new build going ahead?

Thank you in advance

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 04 July 2014 14:10
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 140823

Comment for Planning Application 140823

Name : Carrie-Ann Holland
Address : 20 Papermill Avenue
Donside Village
Aberdeen
AB24 2PB

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I object to the addition of more housing than was originally planned. I don't think there should be so much building so close to the river. We are lucky to have such a quiet walkway down by the riverside which will eventually continue through to Seaton Park. The lovely thing about the path is the fact you can almost forget you are in the heart of the city. Walking past big blocks is not going to help you forget!

I also have concerns about the limited parking provision proposed for a site where parking is already a common cause for complaint.

With only one road access for the whole of Donside Village, which will soon be on to a road with higher traffic flow due to the 3rd Don Crossing, adding even more housing, and therefore traffic, would be detrimental to the village feel of the area. It will increase congestion and the volume of traffic passing along Papermill Avenue which would effectively cut us off from the open space and river opposite.

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.