

To Aberdeen City Council
Planning department.
reference

Application Reference: 160552

Local Authority Reference: 100011291-001

Proposal Description: Proposed development of 21 units with associated landscaping and pa

Ground Floor Flat.
Birchwood House
1 South Avenue,
Cults ,
AB15 9LP
17th may 2016

Dear sir, I wish to object to the proposed new scheme for the following reasons:

1. I do not accept the publicity material that is biased and is a public relations exercise that does not take into account much of the background of the site and local area or the views of direct neighbours.
2. Already trees under tree preservation orders have been mysteriously tampered with and coincidentally appear to be ones which are directly impacted by the development.
3. The tree drawing shows trees on the east boundary conveniently describe them as of poor quality; whose opinion ? it is a very skewed view about the quality of these trees. They are healthy and require proper management and this has not been a responsibility borne by the current owner.
4. The design and access statement does not show a winter view of the east wall when there are no leaves present, they have chosen only the most favorable views: During the winter months there is complete visibility across the wall and this will now be for 21 families instead of the 3 families allowed under previous planning which met the criteria for sensible development.
5. The benefits quoted in the document are political in nature and not relevant to those of us with a real interest of what is put into this site.
6. There are express conditions which Glendarroch and Silverlea are entitled to enforce as determined by a recent land tribunal. The findings of this tribunals seems to be completely disrespected and disregarded by this application. The private planning controls should be respected as lawful and cannot be easily brushed aside with the political arguments shown in the publicity materials issued by this new planning application.

7. it will adversely affect the ability of new registrations at the local health clinic which is not ready to accept the burden of increases of artificial high density schemes in South avenue.

8. It will become impossible in rush hour to gain access to the Deeside road and will add 20 minutes to journey before it has started.

9. Noise and so on from 0700 in the morning is not acceptable to young families and retired persons who are adjacent to the site. We suffered in the recent past for some time due to the noise from the large construction of a large private house over the wall on the south side with the constant reversing tones of a variety of vehicles as they went about their work. Unbearable, we should not have to bear this again.

10. If this goes ahead it forces another view about the desirability to stay in the area and we may be forced to consider the release of our properties to the highest bidder to provide more high density developments : how would you reject this? which then makes a mockery of so called planned developments; the local infrastructure is already at capacity.

11 Issues about height, number of dwelling, tree preservation are all ignored in the new planning application according to tribunal findings: why is this?

Yours sincerely C R MC'Cartney

