

CULTER COMMUNITY COUNCIL



CULZEAN
95 North Deeside Road
Peterculter
Aberdeen
AB14 0QL

1st July 2015

Ms Dineke Brasier, Planning Officer
Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Dear Ms Brasier

Planning Application P15/0920: 31 Hillside Road, Peterculter: Planning in Principle to split existing feu to create 2 detached dwellings

Planning Application P15/0920 was discussed at the June monthly meeting of Culter Community Council (CCC) and passed it to CCC Planning Sub-Group for further discussion and to formulate objections, concerns and comments. Site visits and meetings to assess the proposal have been carried out and owners of adjacent properties and surrounding residents have raised strong concerns and objections to this proposal to CCC.

CCC responded 15th February 2015 to application P15/0009 (now withdrawn) for this site and communicated objections, concerns and comments. At that time residents in adjacent properties formally approached CCC for support in opposing this Curtilage Split. Investigations confirmed concerns expressed at our January monthly meeting. Bearing in mind this previous application and comments, application P15/0920 must be treated as a new application therefore all matters arising have been evaluated and addressed.

Site:

The site of this application is unusual. It lies at the west end of Hillside Road on a privately maintained unadopted section of road which descends steeply to join The Bush. A detached bungalow sits at the northeast corner on the flattest part of the site in harmony in physical appearance and garden settings with neighbouring houses. Existing residents enjoy positive amenities (daylight, sunlight, privacy, etc.), landscape setting and character in accordance with Local Development Plan (LDP) para.3.27 and Policy D6.1.

The garden of 31 Hillside Road, being on the side of the hill, slopes steeply south and west. To the west a steep bank is well above and overlooking the house and garden of 33 Hillside Road at the bottom of the hill. This banking gradually decreases in height to the south. An existing 1.5metre boundary fence between properties 31 and 33 provides no privacy. Privacy was previously provided by mature trees and shrubs (now removed) growing along the top of this embankment. A proposed new 1.8m high boundary fence cannot afford privacy in view of site elevation differences.

In order to build house 31B granite outcrop rock break-up and removal would be necessary. In my experience as a professional engineer the seismic impact of fracture to remove such granite rock must be fully assessed as it may have damaging effects on adjacent properties. This is evident in nearby properties where use of rock breaking equipment damaged structures and foundations. Such actions may also destabilise previously stable drainage to detriment of lower lying properties and facilities.

Description of the west end of Hillside Road and its use:

The west end of Hillside Road from Nos 28 and 31 runs steeply downhill. Access is via a narrow unmade up private road with no pavements rejected for adoption unless considerable private investment is made in upgrade. At the bottom of the hill it joins The Bush, another narrow unmade up private road with pedestrian only through traffic. Both are primarily used by young children from the highly populated Johnston Gardens/ Malcolm Road and adjoining areas to walk to and from Culter Primary School and by older children to catch buses at the east end of Hillside Road (junction with Coronation Road) to transport them to and from Cults Academy.

Because Coronation Road, Hillside Road, and the Bush became a 'rat run' as the 'unofficial Culter Bypass' Aberdeen City Council Roads Department closed the west (private) end of Hillside Road and The Bush to through traffic in the interests of public safety as well as to protect the rights of residents.

In this new application P15/0920 the applicant is proposing two driveways. That existing for 31A causes no problems; the new drive for 31B opens directly opposite numbers 30 and 28 existing driveways on to the narrow part of Hillside Road where it is single unmade track without pavements. Onsite parking (no garages provided) appears limited for potential household capacity. If cars were to be parked on the private road by residents and/or their visitors then this would obstruct No's 28 and 30 driveway accesses, create unsafe conditions for all users and impede passage of emergency and public utility vehicles. Parking in the area is already a serious concern with further development likely to exacerbate matters.

Proposed SUDS Pond and Garden Space

The roof of the present bungalow at 31 Hillside Road has runoff incorporated into existing mains drainage system. Runoff currently does not affect neighbouring properties or communal facilities.

A SUDS pond intended to capture runoff from roofs and driveways of the proposed development raises serious concerns. Sited near the bottom of the south facing slope above the level of properties at 46 Hillview Road, 'Siglavik' on The Bush and 33 Hillside Road CCC questions if overflow or seepage from the proposed SUDS pond could result in water migration into lower lying properties and public facilities. Construction nearby within last 12 years uses closed storage tanks draining to public network under control over time to avoid overload. Due to extent of impervious granite rock likely present at this site proposal for 'soak-away' and SUDS approaches to drainage are questioned.

Trees and shrubs absorb significant amounts of water and stabilize top-soils. None was seen previously seeping from banks at this site. With removal of trees and shrubs at site such benefits have been lost. The presence of granite resulting in need for special drainage provisions for this site is not addressed. Proposals in the design brief for use of 'permeable' driveway and hard standing parking areas seem at odds with impermeable granite along which water not directed to a drainage network will percolate off site and become somebody else's problem.

Summary of CCC objections, concerns, comments and questions

After considering all information supplied and circumstances surrounding this application for curtilage split members of CCC agreed to express the following strong objections:

- Splitting the feu (curtilage) constitutes overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policy H1.1 of the current Local Development Plan (LDP)
- Two large houses will have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area, particularly adjacent properties, contrary to Policy H1.2 of the LDP
- Large three storey houses would significantly impact the landscape character and elements which contribute to the distinct 'sense of place' created by the present style of housing on Hillside Road contrary to Policy D6.1 of the LDP
- The proposed feu split does not comply with Supplementary Guidance on Curtilage Splits contrary to Policy H1.4 in the LDP.
 - Page 6 para 5.2 "No more than one third of the total site area for each individual curtilage should be built upon". This would be in keeping with the majority of houses in Hillside Road.
 - Page 7 para 5.6 "In all circumstances the scale and massing of any new developments should complement the scale of the surrounding properties" which the proposed two new executive houses would not do.
 - Page 7/8 para 6.1 "Loss of significant trees can be a valid reason for refusal of planning permission". With this in mind "presumption in favour of retaining semi-mature and mature trees either within the site or immediately adjacent to it..."; "Care should be taken to minimise potential disturbance of root systems"; "...replacement planting will be required..." etc. Such guidance has clearly been ignored as the trees on the site have been felled in order to make room for the second house (31B).
 - The developer has ignored the fact that the trees and shrubs removed provided privacy to the house and garden at No33 which "a solid fence or wall of 1.8 metre" would not and cannot provide. CCC question drawings on the website which indicate that proposed house 31B would be on practically level standing with No 33 which is not the case.
- Nothing in Guidance addresses proposal to site driveways for proposed new houses on to a single track private road without pavements and directly opposite driveways of existing properties. CCC is concerned that the proposed design for 31B elevates risk and inconvenience to neighbours (28 & 30), pedestrians, other residents and users of Hillside Road.
- CCC conclude that insufficient consideration has been given to providing access/ egress and onsite parking to the proposed development in view of high pedestrian footfall on Hillside Road with no pavements and need for emergency and public utility vehicle access.
- The proposal for a SUDS pond in an area where impermeable granite is evident over much of the site constitutes unquantified risk of seepage and overflow to lower lying properties and public areas including 33 Hillside Road, 'Siglavik', The Bush and 46 Hillview Road.

CCC strongly opposes the splitting of this unusual curtilage but could support redevelopment of this site on condition that:

- A single building of footprint does not extended by more than 50% of current building footprint or option for two 'affordable' semi-detached properties of 2/3 modest bedroom size served by one common entrance and parking area fitting this criteria is proposed.
- Single storey or one and a half storey building design with height no greater than that of existing bungalow ridge line and in similar location in relation to site boundaries be adopted.
- Development in harmony with neighbouring property and the landscape/streetscape/'sense of place' of Hillside Road
- A screen of trees (new mature planting required) provides privacy for the house and garden at 33 Hillside Road aiding stability of the embankment.
- Driveway entrance to remain where it is (well away from those of 28 and 30)
- SUDS pond is not created to deal with rain or snow melt run-off but instead holding tanks and controlled over flow to main drainage as previously used in redevelopments close by.
- Onsite parking sufficient to ensure no parking on the single track private end of Hillside Road in the interests of public (especially child) safety. Note that through traffic from this end of Hillside Road via The Bush to and from Malcolm road and all adjoining roads is closed by bollards. Only pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles are able to negotiate the installed features. Access to a small number of residential garages, driveways and parking spaces is facilitated with care. Access to public service and utility vehicles must likewise remain unimpeded.

David J. Wakefield

David J. Wakefield
Acting Planning Liaison Officer
Culter Community Council

Cc: Councillors Boulton, Malone and Malik

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 07 July 2015 17:23
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150920

Comment for Planning Application 150920

Name : william hector
Address : 29 Hillside Road

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Two large houses squeezed into a small space would be totally out of character with the area also access is via a small private road which raises safety concerns with extra traffic.

Surrounding building foundations could be damaged with building work as hard rock must be excavated.

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: 07 July 2015 21:39
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150920

Comment for Planning Application 150920

Name : Alexander Leitch
Address : 30 Hillside Road
Peterculter,
AB140TX

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : We have the following comments on Planning Application 150920 31 Hillside Road.

We recognise that the plans have been modified since application 150009 which has addressed some of our initial concerns by setting houses further from the front edge of the property and reducing the house height; however we maintain our objection to the planning application for two houses on a plot which formerly only had one house on it for the following reasons.

1. General Plan and impact on Hillside Road - The proposed two houses will have a much larger width profile than the existing cottage which will not be in keeping with the current look and layout of Hillside road as it will create an impression of the houses being squeezed in. This is not how this end of Hillside road is currently as the houses are well spaced. This will change the look and feel of this end of Hillside road to the detriment of existing residents. A single modern house replacing the existing cottage in a similar style as proposed with better parking and onsite garage would be a far superior proposal and would be in keeping with the rest of Hillside Road.
2. Parking and Road surface condition / impact - The proposed two houses do not have any garages and have limited parking space. This will lead to more cars manoeuvring and parking on the slope adjacent to our house on a very narrow road, which in the winter is at times treacherous. The road outside our house is already in poor condition and as one of the houses will have a new driveway opposite our house, this will increase the wear and tear on the road. As it is an un-adopted road we will have to bear significant expense to repair the road surface. There will also be significantly increased wear and damage to the road surface caused by the heavy construction vehicles and building material deliveries to the plots. As a minimum the road needs to be put back to the condition it is in before construction starts or improved to offset the additional future wear and tear from the new driveway.
3. Construction Impact – The road outside our house is narrow, the construction vehicles will not have space to be parked on the plot with two houses, this will cause obstruction and inconvenience to me and my family by blocking access to our property and potentially causing damage my existing driveway / perimeter walls during the construction.
4. Home working disruption - As both my wife and I regularly work from home I am also concerned with the inevitable chaos and disruption to services (phone and power) which will occur as the construction starts digging up the property / road potentially cutting phone lines and power lines.

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: DUNCAN Mike [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 July 2015 09:10
To: PI
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application 150920 -31 Hillside Road Peterculter

I wish to object to the above Planning Application on the following points

One of the proposed houses access on to The Bush Road which is a Private Road and no consultation has been made by the applicant with the owners of the road.

This is an access road for 6 properties and we cannot have it blocked or closed in any way during construction by heavy vehicles or to run any services to the property. As the road is closed off by bollards access is required via Hillside Road by Council Vehicles, Emergency Vehicles, delivery vans as well residents in and out. It is also used as access by two further properties to the rear of their properties. We would require written assurances of this

With similar developments in the area I note that the number of vehicles per house would be far greater than the 2 allowed for on the plans. This would result in cars being parked out with the property and restricting access to our properties.

I was of the understanding that if one property was demolished then only one was allowed to be built. I have no issue with one house being built but two would I feel over develop the site and be out of character with the area.

Michael G. Duncan

35 The Bush Peterculter Aberdeen AB14 0UX

Mike Duncan

Equipment and Maintenance Specialist
Sodexo Remote Sites Scotland Limited

T: +44 (0) [REDACTED]

M: +44 (0) [REDACTED]

The Sodexo logo consists of the word "sodexo" in a lowercase, sans-serif font. A small star is positioned above the letter 'o'.

World leader in Quality of Daily Life Solutions www.sodexo.com
Join the fight against hunger: www.stophungertoday.com

This e-mail, attachments included, is confidential. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you are not an intended recipient, any use, copy or diffusion, even partial of this message is prohibited. Please delete it and notify the sender immediately. Since the integrity of this message cannot be guaranteed on the Internet, SODEXO cannot therefore be considered liable for its content.

Ce message, pièces jointes incluses, est confidentiel. Il est établi à l'attention exclusive de ses destinataires. Si vous n'êtes pas un destinataire, toute utilisation, copie ou diffusion, même partielle de ce message est interdite. Merci de le détruire et d'en avertir immédiatement l'expéditeur. L'intégrité de ce message ne pouvant être garantie sur Internet, SODEXO ne peut être tenu responsable de son contenu.

PI

From: Simon Reece [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 July 2015 17:36
To: PI
Subject: Planning application 150920

Dear Sir / Madam,

We would like to register our objections to the proposed development (150920) at 31 Hillside Road, Peterculter.

We object for the following reasons:

We feel that the proposed house to the east of the property will be too large on three floors and we that our property will be overlooked by by the extensive glass on three levels.

Although an attempt has been made to address concerns about parking, we feel that more provision for parking and ensuring that drivers do not reverse out on to Hillside Road is required

Regards,

Simon Reece
32 Hillview Road
Peterculter
Aberdeen
AB14 0UB

Sent from my iPad

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 01 July 2015 13:30
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150920

Comment for Planning Application 150920

Name : Brian Moggach
Address : 28 Hillside Road
Peterculter
Aberdeen

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I wish to object on the following grounds.

1 Overdevelopment

The houses are disproportionately large in comparison the size of the plots. Although they appear to meet the 33 percent density guideline, I would suggest a lower figure would be more appropriate. They do compliment the size of surrounding properties and will affect the pattern of development in the surrounding area.

2 Road/Traffic

The Bush Road was closed by the council about a year ago on the grounds of road safety.

Over the years it had become a 'rat run' and was carrying a volume of traffic that was a danger to pedestrians, particularly the elderly and young children. The road is used by many children on their way to Culter School. It is in a poor state of repair and has no pavements.

Additional traffic will be introduced to the road. There are very few one car families these days, particularly amongst the more affluent. In addition, it is becoming more common for grown up children to remain parental home well into their twenties. The children often have their own car. Considering these are 3 and 4 bedroom houses, that are most likely to be purchased by affluent families, we could see a large number of vehicles parked outside these properties. The road is quite narrow and serves as an access route for emergency vehicles. It therefore requires to be kept relatively clear as any cars parked in the street could cause access problems for larger emergency vehicles.

3 Privacy and Overlooking

Although there appears to be over 18 metres between the front of my house and the proposed development, this may not be enough in this case. The public face of the existing property faces away from the street. The rear faces the street and it has only two small windows and a door with a window therein, all of which are fitted with obscured glass. There is currently no privacy or overlooking problem.

The new development has the public face onto the street with 4 large windows and a porch. As my property site significantly higher the proposed development I will now be looking down into the rooms of one of the properties. In addition, the widows on the upper floor of the property will be looking down into my living room. No amount of screening will resolve this.

4 Precedent

William Munro,
33 Hillside Road,
Peterculter
Aberdeen
28/6/15

Objections

Dear Sir/Madam,

Introduction

My wife and I are the resident owners of 33 Hillside Road, Peterculter, the property adjacent to the site which is the subject of Planning Application No. 150920. We submit that the application should be refused on the following grounds.

The proposed design is of a density, scale and pattern that is completely out of character with the neighbourhood and pays scant regard to the slope(s) of the site that makes the design unwieldy, totally out of keeping and a severe impairment of the amenity that our property has enjoyed for more than 40 years.

It is grossly overbearing, blocks out sunlight from our front garden and towers above our ridge line very close to our boundary.

The proposal shows that the applicant has no interest in the existing amenity, privacy and character of the plot or neighbourhood. The top of the boundary fence between our property and the site is about two metres below the base of 31B property. Instead of green tree screening, which has existed for 40 years, we would be presented with a side wall higher than our ridge, extending from our front garden to nearly the back of our house line.

The proposers have failed to comply with the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP) and instead, have proceeded to circumvent these by clearing the site of trees rather than submit a tree survey (see Trees below). By doing so, the application has made it impossible to make the proposed redevelopment satisfy the basic obligations to the adjoining property and neighbourhood.

The Density and Scale of the Development

The ALDP plan guidance states that new dwellings should be designed to, "complement those of the surrounding area" and to "respect the relationship between buildings and their surrounding spaces created by gardens and other features". This development, extending deep into the available space lengthwise and widthwise, with three levels at one end, is totally out of proportion and scale to anything in the area.

For over 40 years the existing detached property with integral garage, has been situated at street level screened from our property by a line of mature trees which has enhanced the amenity and privacy of both properties on a site that slopes North-South and steeply East - West.

There are no houses in this part of The Bush without a garage. To demolish a detached property with integral garage, split the feu into two so that two houses can be built with no space for a garage, is clear evidence that the object in mind is not associated with the amenity and character of the neighbourhood.

Trees

The ALDP Supplementary Guidance entitled "The sub-division and redevelopment of residential curtilages - March 2012" s6.0 "Trees and garden ground" clearly states that ,

"Trees make a valuable contribution to the landscape setting of urban area and the loss of significant trees can be a valid reason for refusal of planning permission. With this in mind there will be a presumption in favour of retaining semi mature and mature trees ... regardless of whether they are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or sited in a Conservation Area. Where mature or semi-mature trees are located on a site a tree survey will require to be submitted with the planning application in accordance with guidance in British Standard BS 5837. Care should be taken to position new buildings to minimise potential disturbance to the root system or tree canopy. If trees are to be lost, replacement planting will be required where possible to mitigate for the loss".

There is no evidence that the applicants included a tree survey with the previous application 150009, as required by the ALDP. The Committee report on the previous application 150009 pointed out that, "clearing the plot of trees and shrubs would have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood". Within two weeks of that report, the owners instructed contractors to do exactly that, and have cleared the plot of all mature trees and shrubs on the plot.

Decimating the area of trees to make space so that a building can be squeezed into the cleared space shows a shocking disregard for the amenity and privacy of ourselves and of the character of the area.

The spirit and intent of the Development Plan has been flouted in an act of environmental vandalism. The loss of habitat for many nesting birds is lamentable and would never have been condoned by Mrs Geddes. The only way to restore the amenity and privacy is to include replanting of screening trees between the site and 33 Hillside Road on the west side.

Ground Stability – Retaining Wall

The trees that the owner has cleared from the site absorbed significant amounts of water from the ground. The tree root system added stability to the steeply sloping ground above our property. Without any trees, the development fails to include the provision of a retaining wall to ensure that the substrate from 31 does not subside into our property.

Overbearing

The main problem with the proposed development is that 31B totally overbears our property and now presents us with a stark bare wall that extends from our front garden to almost our back wall line.

The design describes a 1.8 m fence on the boundary between 31B and our property. However, there already is a 1.8m fence on the boundary, which lies at the bottom of a steep slope. The top of this fence would be about 2m below the bottom of the proposed building 31B. The steep slope of the site and the clearing of the site of trees means the elongated side wall of 31B is not screened in any way from 33.

Being on a steep hillside and situated below the curtilage in question, our amenity and privacy is severely prejudiced if this development were to be approved.

Loss of Privacy

Our property, the front garden, the patio area at the side of our house and our back garden was screened from the development site by a row of mature and semi mature trees throughout the year, and shrubs and bushes in summer. The removal of all trees from the site, with no proposed screening, severely compromises the privacy we have enjoyed for 10 and a half years.

The gallery windows that face south at the bottom of the property, are raised well above the ground level on three floors. Our back garden is in view of these gallery windows and our privacy is therefore adversely affected.

Having cleared the site of trees, our front bedroom window is no longer screened from the existing property by mature trees. The proposed development affords no screening from its elevated position.

Loss of amenity, daylight and sunlight,

For the past ten and a half years, my wife and I have grown flowers and vegetables in a raised bed garden in our patio area at the side of our house that lies adjacent to the West boundary of the proposed development site. We have enjoyed the morning sun and daylight from the east, (especially in the summer when the sun rises in the North East), the pleasure of the various mature and semi mature trees, the birds and bees that thrive in the trees and shrubs of the garden of the development site adjacent to our East boundary fence.

The proposed building on the western half of the split fee would encroach to within about 2.5 metres of our fence, and would tower above our current skyline, completely overshadowing our property and site, blocking out sunlight and daylight until the sun got round to the south western skyline. Since we are lower down the side of the hill, the proposed building would tower above our house and without any tree screening, would present us with a solid wall for the entire length of our house and well into our front garden space. Our upstairs landing window currently gets natural light from the eastern sky. The proposed development would totally block that sunlight and daylight. The removal of all the trees (and bird-life) from the site has already severely damaged the amenity and character of the area.

Roads and Vehicle Access

The site currently has a driveway that leads onto Hillside Road at the very top of a hill that leads down to The Bush. The proposed development adds a second entrance driveway partway down the hill. The hill leading to The Bush is a private road with no pavements, which narrows at the position where cars would be exiting the proposed site. The safety of pedestrians, schoolchildren, dog walkers, cyclists and other users would be seriously impaired with the prospect of cars entering/exiting the site onto the hill at this narrow point in the road.

It is inevitable that in time, there will be more cars than parking space available in the proposed driveways of the development.

There is no "kerbside" on the unadopted private road no traffic control. When visitors leave their cars parked outside the property on the hill, other resident access would be hampered and emergency vehicles would not be able to get past the narrow neck.

Drainage – Rainwater - Soakaway - SUDS

In our time at 33 Hillside Road, our garage – situated at the very lowest corner of the two slopes – has flooded from run-off from the adjacent development site.

Without the mature trees, the water is set to run-off downwards towards our property along the adjacent boundary and will also funnel in two directions to the rear of our garage and beyond. There must be a question about whether the existing drainage infrastructure can cope with the added demand.

Concluding Remarks

We appreciate the opportunity to bring to your attention our deep concerns about the potential adverse impact on the character and keeping of neighbourhood, our property and amenity if this application is granted.

Since the last application, we see nothing in the minor design adjustments to make us feel that the application has met the basic requirements of the ALDP. The clearing of the site of mature trees is lamentable and shows that the applicants are not concerned about the amenity and character of the neighbourhood, if it interferes with their proposal.

This site cannot support two properties of the scale proposed, without seriously damaging the character and keeping of the neighbourhood and our privacy and amenity.

We trust that the committee will exercise it's wisdom, and conclude that the application should be refused.

Thank you and best regards
Bill and Chrissi Munro

Siglawik
The Bush
Peterculter
Aberdeen
AB14 0UA

6 March 2015

Aberdeen City Council
Development Management
Planning and Sustainable Development
Business Hub 4
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref: Application Number 150920, Proposed Development at 31 Hillside Road, Peterculter,
Aberdeen, AB14 0TX

We are in receipt of notification of the above application. Having reviewed the full planning application and associated plans, we are somewhat shocked and very concerned by the proposed development for a number of reasons. We wish to put forward the following objections which we trust that Aberdeen Council, in its experience, will agree are duly founded:

We believe the proposed development would represent an over-development of the existing site. The current property is a small, single storey bungalow with a garden which until recently contained mature trees and shrubs. The proposal is to split the existing feu into two plots and build two properties of far greater proportions than the existing property on the current single feu. The properties on the proposed development are far too large a footprint for the size of each plot and would not be in keeping with the Aberdeen local plan. Please note, the mature trees and shrubs were cut down shortly after the previous application (number 150009) was withdrawn. We are sure that Aberdeen Council will be fully aware of the applicant's intentions and motivation for doing so. We believe this has been done in a calculated manner to try and ease the process of this current application.

In addition to the size of the properties in comparison to the ground in which they will sit, the character of them is unlike any other property in the vicinity. Most of the properties in the area are traditional in character and no higher than two story. Although other properties in this area have been built more recently, this has been done with sympathy to the existing properties in the surrounding area. The proposed properties do not appear to have been thought through with any sympathy or indeed compatibility for or with the surrounding area and are totally out of keeping with the rest of the street.

The roof height of the property 31B is far higher than those in surrounding properties, which is a further example of how incompatible the buildings are with others in the area. The design of the properties is such that both properties which contain large windows on all floors, will overlook our garden, causing substantial loss of privacy to our family.

The plans make mention of SUDS, the location of which is behind the north-facing fence in our garden. Our first objection here is that the size and spec is shown as "TBC" (which we assume to be an acronym for To Be Confirmed.) Due to the proximity of the SUDS to our own garden, stating "TBC" is wholly unsatisfactory due to the detrimental effect an unsuitable SUDS facility would cause to our own property. Further to this, since the applicant has recently removed the mature trees and shrubs behind the current bungalow, flooding will be a significant problem due to the fact there is no natural drainage left.

In addition, the development site already sits on a downward gradient towards our garden (from two angles) and may cause water to pool once it flows under the fence and into our garden (which is flat and therefore with no natural run-off. We are extremely concerned at the effects of an inappropriate SUDS facility which will lead to our garden becoming saturated and flooded.

The access and egress for the proposed development is of further concern to us. Whilst the existing access is via the main part of Hillside Road, directly opposite Hillside Place, the proposed development is accessed further down the hill on Hillside Road. This is already an extremely narrow road with little or no room for two cars travelling in opposite directions to pass. The road is not open to public access (having been closed in 2014 to protect pedestrians) and has always been very poorly maintained. The development will cause an increase in traffic both in terms of the residents of each property and visitors to the properties. There are no pavements on the lower part of Hillside Road and vehicles exiting the proposed properties will cause a safety risk to the many pedestrians who use it (this route is used by school children every day.)

Whilst we understand that the construction in its self of any proposed development is not normally a material planning consideration, I feel it is important to highlight the fact that Hillside Road is the only means of access and egress to and from our residence. Due to the location of the development we cannot foresee how our access and egress will be guaranteed during construction. Hillside Road is not significantly wide to allow heavy goods or construction vehicles to be passed by residential vehicles. Due to the access and egress to the proposed development site, construction traffic would be unable to access the site without blocking off Hillside Road to residential traffic.

We trust that Aberdeen Council's planning team will give due consideration to our objections, and agree that these objections are based in common sense and genuine concern for our residence.

Yours faithfully

Mr & Mrs George Batchelor

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number:	150920	
RECEIVED	07 JUL 2015	
Nor	See <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MAE
Case Officer: Initials	DIB	
Date Acknowledged	08/07/2015	