

ROSEMOUNT & MILE - END COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Head of Planning & Infrastructure
Planning Department
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

30 April 2015.

Dear Sir / Madam,

Planning Reference :- P150530
35 Mile-End Avenue Aberdeen

I refer to the above planning application & raise the following issues on behalf of the Rosemount & Mile -End Community Council.

It now appears to be common practice for many property owners to erect extensions to existing buildings at will without due consideration to neighbours & the area at large. This application is a classic example of this approach.

The proposed extension at No 35 will impinge on the light currently enjoyed at No 37. This alone would appear to invoke planning regulations & furthermore be against responsible common practice in allowing an extension to be added to one property which is clearly inhibitive to the living environment enjoyed by the owners of the adjacent property. Suffice to say it will have a detrimental effect on the value of the affected property.

In cases such as this it is unlikely that sufficient correspondence will be received by your Department for this case to be referred to the Planning Committee for a decision. However before any further action is taken the R&MECC would urge that your officers undertake a site visit as a matter of urgency.

At this stage therefore the R&MECC submit a formal objection to this application.

Yours faithfully,


G A Duncan
(On behalf of the Rosemount & Mile-End Community Council)

35 Mile End
Ave.
Community Council

01 MAY 2015

SEH

P150530 - SEH

59 Mile-End Avenue
Aberdeen AB15 5PT
1st May 2015

Planning and Sustainable Development
Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Dear Sirs

Application no 150530: 35 Mile-End Avenue

The above application for planning permission for an extension at 35 Mile-End Avenue has come to our attention.

The proposed construction does not resemble in any way the extensions which have already been built, amicably and appropriately, along the street. We consider that it would be intrusive and completely out of sympathy with the surrounding properties, and it would clearly detract from the amenity of those properties.

We are strongly opposed to the planned development and trust that it will not be allowed to proceed.

Yours faithfully



John S Witte



Katherine Witte

George Milne

P150530 - SEM

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 28 April 2015 15:05
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150530

Comment for Planning Application 150530

Name : Sara Giudici
Address : 41 Mile-end Avenue

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I object the planning application 150530 as:

- the proposed extension style doesn't match the neighbourhood's style When we decided to move to #41 we really liked the idea of living in a lovely victorian neighbourhood. The monolithic timber extension will have a very bad impact on the general style of Mile-End.

it is a (too) huge extension which spams from one wall to the other of the garden, definitely too close to the next door neighbours'.

it is not respecting the neighbours' privacy

- Due to its size and the material used, it will completely cut the sunlight of the rooms downstairs of 37 Mile-end.

Thank you.

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

P150530 - SEM

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 03 May 2015 12:40
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150530

Comment for Planning Application 150530

Name : Dr Howard Gemmell
Address : 61 Mile-End Avenue
Aberdeen AB15 5PT

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Extension to 35 Mile-End Avenue, Aberdeen AB15 5PT

I live at 61 Mile-End Avenue. Mile-End Avenue is an almost continuous terrace of houses and flats. Many of these houses have extensions at the rear as we do ourselves. Ours and our neighbours (at No 59) were built fairly recently and we both ensured that they did not block the light into neighbouring gardens. In particular we agreed that the extensions should not be across the whole width of the site with a flat roof as this would be very intrusive on the neighbouring houses. Also Mile-End slopes down towards the Westburn Road so any extension will be significantly higher, around 0.5 m, than its actual height for one of the neighbours.

I am therefore objecting to the planned extension to No 45 because of the precedent it would set. Unlike the many existing extensions in Mile-End Avenue this extension is for the whole width of the site with a flat roof and would overshadow the neighbours and block out their light. It is interesting that the plans show a small courtyard at the rear of the extension presumably to maintain natural light into the rear ground floor room. It seems a bit hypocritical not to show the same consideration to the neighbours.

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 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.

150530 - SEM

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 06 May 2015 18:25
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150530

Comment for Planning Application 150530

Name : Patricia Robinson
Address : 68, Mile-end Avenue,
Aberdeen

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED] type :

Comment : I would see this proposed modern structure as out of keeping with the surrounding area both in its design and in its size. An extension of such 21st century character and of such dimensions appears incongruous in this area, where residents can currently enjoy the amenities of desirable Victorian properties in a relatively unspoiled previously designated Heritage area. There is clearly scope, of which many have taken advantage, to extend along the existing building line. This contemporary extension, however, constituting a major living area outwith and disproportionate to the original family home and crossing the whole width of the garden would appear bizarre in these traditional surroundings, in no way complementing a granite terrace. It would not seem designed with due consideration for its context' nor to make 'a positive contribution to its setting', as recommended in section D1 of the Local Policy.

In addition, while affording considerably more amenities for some, this substantial construction would grossly detract from the amenity of existing neighbours, who face being hemmed in and overshadowed, immediately on their boundary, by a wall the proportions of which appear excessive in relation to the narrowness of the adjoining garden area. Such a major extension in an area, where there are other large gardens would, also, clearly create a precedent for further development insensitive to the environment.

I would on, the above grounds, urge rejection of this application.

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.

P150530 - SEH

37 Mile-End Avenue
ABERDEEN AB15 5PT

5 May 2015

Planning and Sustainable Development
Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Dear Sirs

Planning application no 150530
Proposed extension to No 35 Mile-End Avenue, Aberdeen

We have received your notice relating to the above application, and we wish to state our objections as follows.

Scale and design

We recognise that owners of houses in this area do wish to modernise their properties by adding extensions to their buildings, to increase the available space and perhaps to change the way they use the space. There are already several extensions to the rear of properties in the area. These have on the whole been designed sympathetically, taking account of the character and construction of these terraced houses and respecting the space between them. But the extension envisaged would not only be out of proportion, taking up the entire width of the garden, but would be quite out of keeping with the surrounding houses in style. If constructed it would create a precedent which, if followed, would alter the character of the neighbourhood beyond recognition.

Loss of Daylight

The application states that there would be some loss of light to our property at No 37 Mile-End Avenue. On the contrary, we believe that the reduction in light would be very significant.

The architect acknowledges that there would be some reduction in the amount of light reaching our living/dining-room window in the west-facing wall (marked A in the plans). But we have 3 windows (not 2, as indicated in the plans submitted to you) at ground level in the south facing wall of our house, the largest of these being the window of the room currently used as a dining kitchen - an important living area. We believe that the loss of light to these windows resulting from the construction of a high wall at a distance of only 3 m would be so considerable as to make the ground floor rooms not only less suitable for their current use, but also less attractive for possible development/modernisation (for example by removing a wall between the dining kitchen and the adjoining utility room to create a larger kitchen/dining space).

The narrow area of garden between the south-facing wall of No 37 and the wall separating the gardens of No 35 and No 37 is currently used not only as a flower garden, but as an outside sitting/eating area. If the planned extension were constructed, this area would be overshadowed by a wall which --

bearing in mind that, as noted in the application, the level of our garden is about 300 mm lower than that of No 35 – would reach to 3 m in height, right up against the existing shared garden wall. Not only would this result in very considerable loss of light to this garden area, but it would make the area feel oppressive and confined. In short it would oblige us to change our way of life.

Access

It appears to us that the construction and maintenance of the northern wall of the proposed extension, and maintenance of gutters or drainpipes, for example, would only be possible by means of access through our property, which would not be acceptable to us.

A further concern is that increased use of the rear of the property at No 35 might lead to more traffic in the private back lane, where parked cars already lead to problems with access to garages, and with keeping vehicle access clear for emergency and for maintenance.

Errors in architect's plans

From our layman's understanding of the architect's plans, we know that there are fundamental inaccuracies. As already pointed out, the number of windows shown is incorrect. In the supporting statement, Example 3A is based on the mistaken assumption that Window A is the only window of an "apartment or dining-room". In fact the largest of our other affected windows is the window of our dining kitchen, in which we spend a great deal of time. This room was originally a living-room (and is so described in the schedule we received when purchasing the house), and, as mentioned, is capable of extension.

Conclusion

It is made clear in the application that the proposed extension is intended to allow the occupants of No 35 to enjoy a different kind of life-style. But the benefits to them would be achieved with almost total disregard for the harmful effect they would have on our property and our quality of life, and on the amenity and character of the neighbourhood as a whole.

Yours faithfully



Bryan and Mary Dargie

P150530 - SEH

45 Mile-End Avenue
Aberdeen AB15 5PT

23.4.2015

Planning and Sustainable Development
Enterprise, Planning and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Dear Sir or Madam

I was appalled to learn about the proposed extension at number 35 Mile-End Avenue's back garden (planning application no 150530). Having studied the proposed plan, it is not in keeping, either in appearance or in scale, with these beautiful Victorian homes. It would set a precedent which would risk changing the character of the neighbourhood altogether.

As for the neighbours who value their privacy this extension would be an eyesore and inconvenience. I would also be concerned that more use of the back of the house giving on to the garden at No 35 would lead to even more parking of cars in the back lane, which already becomes very congested with parked vehicles, making access for maintenance and emergency vehicles extremely difficult.

Yours faithfully



Elizabeth Hardie (Miss)

PI

P150530 - SEM

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
Sent: 04 May 2015 16:25
To: PI
Subject: Planning Comment for 150530

Comment for Planning Application 150530

Name : Jennifer Tait
Address : 48 Cairnfield Place
Midstocket
Aberdeen
AB15 5NA

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : Regarding the proposed single story rear extension for number 35 Mile End Avenue, my concern is the loss of daylighting to number 37 Mile End Avenue both for the garden and window on the western elevation of no 37. This large extension looks out of character for traditional granite properties and my concern is that it might set a precedence for other extensions.

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.

150530 - SEH

10 Craigie Park
Rosemount
Aberdeen
AB25 2SE

30th April 2015

Sepideh Hajisoltani
Planning Officer
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Ref: Single Storey Extension at rear of Existing Dwelling House at 35 Mile-End Ave.
Planning Application 150530

Dear Sepideh Hajisoltani

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed extension at the residence of Mr & Mrs Ian Woodward-Nutt at 35 Mile-End Ave.

The lane at the rear of the properties on Mile-End Ave and Cairnfield Place belong to all the residents of the aforesaid, however permission should be obtained from them all in writing to allow any HGV using it for the purpose of delivering materials to 35 Mile-End Ave should this application be granted.

It should be made quite clear before any work has started should this application be granted that the resident (Mr Woodward-Nutt) and contractor will be responsible for the repair of any damage to the lanes surface and have it in writing that they agree to the aforesaid repairs.

Having visited Mr & Mrs Bryan Dargie residence it is quite clear the quality of natural light & sunlight to their property at present time will be reduced by the proposed extension which will be approx 2.7m in height above the present dividing wall.

Sunlight & Daylight are valued elements in a good quality living environment. However, if designing a new extension or alteration to a residential property care should be taken to safeguard access to sunlight & daylight currently enjoyed by adjoining residents and other properties.

On any extension such as this care must be taken to ensure that soundproofing throughout the extension is of the highest quality.

We all know how sound can travel and if the soundproofing is of poor quality then the residents on either side of 35 Mile-End Ave will be bothered with noise which they wouldn't have experienced in the first place had there not been any extension built.

In the meantime, I can do but hope the council planning committee take the time to visit the site in question and see for themselves the impact this extension will have on the residents Mr & Mrs Bryan Dargie of 37 Mile-End Ave.

Yours sincerely



Willie Jaffray
Resident of Rosemount

P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number: 150530		
RECEIVED 06 MAY 2015		
Nor	Sou	MAP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Case Officer: initials: SEH		
Date Acknowledged: 06/05/2015		

PI

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
 Sent: 01 May 2015 15:34
 To: PI
 Subject: Planning Comment for 150530

Comment for Planning Application 150530

Name : WILLIAM LIPPE ARCHITECTS
 Address : 25 ALBYN PLACE
 ABERDEEN
 AB10 1YL

Telephone : [REDACTED]

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment :

Our reference: 5150

Our Sepiedeh,

Planning objection to proposals for 35 Mile-End Avenue, Aberdeen, AB15 5PT

We write to you on behalf of our client with public comment to the above application which is currently being determined by the planning service.

Under the current Aberdeen Local Development Plan, supplementary guidance is provided specifically for '‘Householder Development’. Under '‘rear and side extensions’, point three '‘conventional terraced dwellings’ [Ruby Row] the guidance clearly states, '‘single storey extensions to terraced dwellings will be restricted to 3m in projection along a mutual boundary’. Planning policy depicts that this dimension is from the existing wall of the terrace row [rear elevation], and not from the building line of any extension or outbuilding. This policy is in place to protect residential amenity.

The proposals at present seeks to extend and infill an external space. The extension in length is 7020mm and 655mm in width. It is noted as '‘single storey’. The height of the extension is substantially higher than one storey, this is clearly identifiable by the roofline of the extension where it currently sits slightly lower than the cill height of the upper windows. Traditionally, cill heights in period dwellings sit 600-700mm off finished floor level. The '‘square’ form of the extension, particularly on the north elevation, means that the occupants of 37 Mile-end Avenue are impacted by the obtrusive and insensitive nature of its form. Planning policy clearly states that modern design will be supported as long as it is appropriate within its surroundings and in this instance, the proposals cannot be viewed as an improvement to the built environment.

Fundamentally, there is no doubt that the extension will have an adverse effect on the external garden area of 37 Mile-end Avenue. At present, the party wall between the property is circ. 1.8m high, and should the proposals be granted, occupants will be overshadowed with a boundary wall that is over 2.7m high. The 300mm level change between the properties only makes the situation worse. Planning policy states '“an extension or alteration proposed should not serve to overwhelm or dominate the original form of appearance of the dwelling” and more importantly '“should not result in a situation where amenity is '‘borrowed’ from an adjacent property. Significant adverse impact on privacy, daylight and general residential amenity”. The design statement submitted with the application recognises that there will be overshadowing to 37 Mile-end Avenue due to the extension.

Furthermore, the application would not be allowed under Permitted development rights due to the structure being on the site boundary and also having a parapet over 3m high.

Regards
Kirsten Will

Associate
Chartered Architect B.Sc Hons MArch RIAS William Lippe Architects Ltd

25 Albyn Place,
Aberdeen, AB10 1YL

4 St James Place, Inverurie
Aberdeenshire, AB51 3UB

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 have received this message in error, you are requested to preserve its confidentiality and advise the sender of the error in transmission. It is the responsibility of the addressee to scan this email and any attachments for viruses or any other defects

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: 150530		
RECEIVED - 5 MAY 2015		
Nor	Sec	MAC
Case Officer Initials: SEM		
Date Acknowledged: 06/05/2015		