

MEMO



ABERDEEN
CITY COUNCIL

To	Matthew Easton Planning & Infrastructure	Date	04/03/2016
		Your Ref.	P151997 (ZLF)
		Our Ref.	TR/GW/1/51/2
From	Roads Projects		
Email	grwhyte@aberdeencity.gov.uk		
Dial	01224 522284		
Fax			

Roads Projects
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Ground Floor North
Marischal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen AB10 1AB

Planning application no. P151997
Chester Hotel, 59-63 Queen's Road, Aberdeen
Variation of Condition 11 attached to Application Ref No. P121555 to allow use of rear access gates.

I have considered the above planning application and have the following observations:

I note the applicant wishes to vary Condition 11 of planning application P121555. The condition prevents general use of the rear access gates in the rear lane behind the hotel. The gates are currently kept locked but opened for hotel deliveries.

Roads Development Management are concerned a variation to the condition to allow use of the rear access gates would not serve a useful purpose and may have a negative impact on users of the rear lane. Restricting use of the rear gates currently serves to deter hotel users from possible rogue parking in the rear lane. Rogue parking in the rear lane would create safety and obstruction issues for users of the lane including residents, walkers and cyclists.

The applicant cites congestion caused by delivery vehicles waiting for the gates to be unlocked as a reason to open the gates for general use. We would consider congestion of any note would not be caused by delivery vehicles given the low traffic numbers and lane width. Consultation with ACC Traffic Management about this reveals they are not concerned. ACC Traffic Management agree there is justification for the condition remaining in place.

Delivery vehicle access in the rear lane is regarded as an issue with a technical solution. A key pad operated barrier system would restrict access to the rear of the hotel for deliveries only and not cause inconvenience to the hotel.

The arguments for removing the condition are insufficient and there are sufficient reasons for the condition to remain.

For the reasons stated above, I recommend refusal of this application.

Pete Leonard
Corporate Director

Gregor Whyte
Engineering Officer