

Comments for Planning Application 161721/DPP

Application Summary

Application Number: 161721/DPP

Address: 19 South Avenue Aberdeen AB15 9LQ

Proposal: Erection of 4 No residential flats and associated car parking

Case Officer: Dineke Brasier

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sheila Small

Address: 17a South Avenue Cults Aberdeen

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:17A

The new proposal will impact significantly on the character and amenity of the immediate vicinity for all residents neighbouring to 19 South Avenue.

Since the owner of 19 has demolished the existing property there has already been significant impact on all residents directly using the entrance and driveway belonging to the owner of West Cults Lodge due to the damage of the driveway entrance caused by heavy plant machinery requiring access to an extremely challenging access site with a 90 degree turn and lack of space for parking as access must remain open to allow access for all other residents.

This has been challenging with site traffic choosing to block the entrance, driveway for all and access to 21 South Avenue over the bottom portion of 19 . It has been very difficult during this 2 year period. Also due to the nature of this site the developer and builders have been parking on private property surrounding this site and blocking use of the public access via South Avenue. The developer damaged the southern wall, bounding his site from the access driveway and consequently after felling trees on his site further damaged this wall making it dangerous demolished this wall which formed the entrance to West Cults Lodge whose owners have yet to be compensated for and no offer to rebuild has been offered by the developer.

There has been complete felling of all existing trees on this development site known as 19 South Avenue since the present developer took ownership, even although it was intimated on his previous application for retrospective planning that all trees would be retained.

With a development of this size proposed this could only be significantly worse and totally unacceptable for all other owners and residents directly located within this area of the Western end of South Avenue.

South Avenue odd numbers have remained single family residences historically and it would be in

the interest of the character to remain so.

The privacy to the bedroom windows at 17a have already been seriously compromised by the developer not retaining the established trees on his site and with the renewed application property being wider, higher and an increase from single dwelling to 4 separate large apartments this will have a serious detrimental effect to privacy of the property directly South with 4 balconies extending the full width of 13.75m overlooking along with a wall of total windows. The original screening to 17a has been completely removed by the developer.

The roads department have advised 6 parking spaces of which there is no space allowance on the developers site without going against the right of access to 21 South Avenue, driving through parked cars not really observing this right.

Another point to raise is that the positioning of the bins, an eyesore to this private driveway appear to be placed south of the 52m boundary. In other wards not on the developers own site but on the driveway of West Cults Lodge. This area is not a lane. This is not acceptable.

Flooding to the pathways at 17a has been occurring on a regular basis, only since the developer demolished the existing house, felled trees, demolished a boundary wall, added a second access to water and raised the level of the land. Also the developer has built a retaining wall to the north west boundary with the garden ground of West Cults Lodge, removed the hedging bounding 21 at the north west beneath the newly built retaining wall and generally used the site for he burning of waste removed from elsewhere and taken to his site.

The fencing built to surround this site has been removed entirely.

The application information is entirely misleading and without a visitation to this site to establish exact boundaries with existing residents and explanation given on this quiet residential single family home character and access arrangements allowable to them via disposition historically feel that planners are not in full view of the facts and fully aware of the restrictions on a development of this size on the site size in relation to other properties and business based here.