

Mrs Y Simpson
32 Cults Court
Cults
AB15 9SZ

3 January 2017

Aberdeen City Council
Planning Department

Dear Ms Brasier

Application Reference – 161721/DPP
Address – 19 South Avenue Aberdeen AB15 9LQ
Proposal – Erection of 4 No residential flats and associated car parking
Case Officer – Dineke Brasier

I refer to the above planning application and submit the following representation:

Figures available from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) indicate that the average UK one-bedroom home is 46 sq m. RIBA found the average UK three-bedroom home is 88 sq m.

In this planning application we are given to understand that each one bedroom flat will have a floor area of between 147 and 153 sq m, i.e. well over one and a half times the floor area of the average UK three-bedroom home.

In addition, plans for each one bedroom flat show two bathrooms, one being adjacent to a dining room large enough to accommodate seating for eight people which implies it is of a size suitable for use as a bedroom and of a design that facilitates partition from the lounge.

Although dimensions have not been supplied, the utility room appears large enough for use as a further bedroom, either in its present configuration or by minor changes to internal walls.

It is not unreasonable to be concerned that what the developer describes as being one bedroom flats are of a size and design with potential and/or suitability for use as two or three bedroom properties with a consequent impact on the amenity of the site.

Is it legitimate that a property be classified as a one bedroom flat when it has the size and characteristics of a much larger property?

Is it incumbent on the council to validate that, should such a development proceed, its extended use will be in accordance with the one bedroom properties detailed in the proposal?

Relevance of precedent

The developer has cited a number of nearby three storey developments, presumably as precedent for their proposal.

None of these feature a restricted walled lane access as is evident in the proposed development at 19 South Avenue. South Avenue has effectively only one direction of access from the main road as the remaining section of road running from the proposed development to School Road is only

partially surfaced.

In the cited properties alternatives exist in the event of access being required for large commercial vehicles or in the event of vehicle breakdown blocking access to the site.

The developers also draw attention to the modest parking provision in some of these other sites, apparently in justification for the 6 parking spaces mentioned on the supporting planning statement. (Note: The developers plan shows that hedging compromises one these parking spaces so that only 5 appear useable).

This does not take account of the fact that vehicles attempting to access the proposed parking area cannot see whether parking spaces are available until they are in a confined space with limited manoeuvrability. No vehicle turning area appears to be incorporated into the plan.

Should all the spaces be occupied then vehicles will need to traverse the single track lane to the main road, causing further congestion at either end of the lane.

It is reasonable to suggest that there will be situations where drivers entering the lane from North Deeside Road will have no choice but to reverse back on to the main road due to oncoming traffic coming up the lane.

I assert that the parking provisions at 19 South Avenue create difficulties and safety concerns that do not exist to the same extent in the other developments cited by the applicants, which includes provision for access and egress of the emergency services.

Daylight issues

The applicants images of the completed development indicate a line of large mature trees running parallel to the access lane. The impression conveyed is that natural light is already shielded from Cults Court. This is not in fact the case. While there are large mature trees at the upper and lower end of the lane, the area between enjoys natural light from the west.

There is not sufficient space in this area of Cults Court to accommodate large trees, therefore the proposed development will have an adverse effect on daylight.

Noise & privacy

The fact that Cults Court cannot effectively be shielded by trees from the proposed development, combined with balconies which afford a view over neighbours, creates noise and privacy issues. The developer has drawn attention to other developments in the area with balconies.

However a direct comparison is questionable due to the relative proximity of neighbours in the confined space occupied by the proposed development.

Height of building

The developer draws attention to the fact that the height of the proposed building is only marginally higher than that approved for the site and compares favourably in scale to the one and a half storey dwelling house that formerly occupied the site.

It seems reasonable to be concerned that whereas the former dwelling house had a pitched roof, the extended roof line cube shape of the proposed development will have greater impact on the amenity of the site.

Yours sincerely

Yfke Simpson
32 Cults Court

