

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 Carolyn Armstrong

Address: West Cults Lodge Cults Aberdeen

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Historically this developer has gained retrospective planning for this site which was fully discussed with us as owners of West Cults Lodge but he has failed to build a property during this time 2 years since approval, and not kept his word as stated with the previous application to retain all existing trees on site. These are fully visible in photos the planning department received on the planning application in 2014.All trees have been felled on site so to state no trees to be removed is accurate on this application as he removed them all as soon as the site was purchased in 2014 as a pre action prior to gaining retrospective planning approval.The developer has removed therefore the natural privacy barrier which also alleviated noise from this site and light infiltration from street lighting and properties to the North security lighting. This was part of the character and amenity of this location and has been spoiled terribly by these actions. He also felled trees on neighbouring land without the written consent of owners. This was to allow e views he so desired. No pre discussion has taken place with regard to this latest application.

He has prevented water reaching our garden ground to the North of 21 South Avenue by switching it off. He has built a retaining wall on the boundary here without seeking our permission or even discussing.

He has also demolished the wall serving as a matching set to the entrance of our property West Cults Lodge at the boundary of his site and our driveway, not a lane as intimated on his new application. The wall had been previously damaged by builders and the company felling all trees on his site. He then chose to demolish without permission and to date has not rebuilt or offered compensation. This wall curved inwardly and the reinstatement will take place which will make the new plan impossible to carry out as there is no space for bins here nor space for a fence as required by the developer.

This new application presents information to planners that are not representative of the boundary and access arrangements in place. The insistence by roads for 6 parking spaces sparks concern

when 4 flats are presented with extremely large metre squared, the equivalent of 3 bed properties not 1 bed flats. They look internally to be easily made into 2 bedded properties for example. I feel as these plans do not appear accurate in terms of land ownership then a visit to this site with the owner of the access entrance and ownership of private driveway is essential, in order to demonstrate accurately the situation in reality to this site.

The plan for parking is essentially on land required for permitted access to 21 South Avenue and therefore not at all feasible. The plan demonstrating a permanent wheelie bin or bins is placed South of the extent of 52m boundary pier and is therefore on our land, our driveway. This can never be acceptable.

The plan itself is inaccurate demonstrating an east and west elevation the wrong way round which does not demonstrate to neighbours the integrity of the design offered and again demonstrates an inaccuracy in design.

CHARACTER and AMENITY

The character of this private ground to the West of South Avenue is seriously undermined by this plan to increase 1 property to 4 properties, flats from the already agreed single family home. This will adversely affect not just this setting but the amenity and access to other residents here.

The privacy to 17a is seriously impacted due to this design and the bedroom window of 17 will be visible from 4 balconies, therefore causing privacy issues.

Historically homes with odd numbers have been retained as single family homes in South Avenue and this should continue to preserve this character in perpetuity as flatted properties out with this west end area of South Avenue have been continuously affecting the character and amenity of longer term residents such as us, a family of 5.

The destruction That has already taken place along with the noise and nuisance from works on site, intimates a developer not interested in maintaining the desirable character and amenity of this residential immediate vicinity.

SITE

The site is not bounded by a lane to the south but a private driveway with permitted access to all other residences and kennels. 19 does not have direct access from public roads and to increase traffic by allowing access to 4 further properties is excessive. No 21 also has access arrangements through this way and has further legal access arrangements across the area of land to the south side of this application site. This is essential to the Es and egress from 21.

The site is currently used by the owner to burn rubbish from elsewhere and has a toilet built on site. Photos of this unsecured site demonstrate the eyesore it has become,

Within the immediate vicinity lie single family dwellings and a kennel established more than sixty years ago.

It is not desirable to have a block of flats at this location overbearing the adjacent property 21 and southern bungalow at 17a.

The applicant states that vehicular access will be taken from South Avenue but does not state that residents of these flats would cross via a private driveway, increasing the burden to the owners of that land further.

The finish of the building in question of brick and larch does not fit the environs here. The size, height and width of this property is too dense and gives overlooking and privacy issues to 21, 17 and 17a South Avenue.

This proposal would if built detract from the character and amenity of the direct vicinity and result in a reduction of value of surrounding properties. The size and extent of this proposal is not desirable and does not give consideration to the context. This will not contribute positively to the setting in the way the planning for 1 family home allowed. It fails to provide a building appropriate to the locus.

Privacy is seriously undermined by the volume of southern windows and 13.75m wide 4 storey high balconies.

21 South Avenue has amenity space South and garden space North. This is not reflected here.

Parking will dominate the southern space and negate legal access arrangements for 21.

Flooding to 17a has become a serious problem since this developer took ownership of the site as he added a second access to the mains and has prevented water access for the northern greenhouse for West Cults Lodge.

The destruction of all trees on site is despicable.

There is privacy issues with bedroom windows of 17 and 17a being severely compromised by the volume of South facing windows on the plan and quadrupled residences.

Land level has been increased by the developer and so overall height compared to the original existing property will be substantial.

ACCESS

With regard to the servitude right of access from South Avenue, over the driveway access belonging to the owner of West Cults Lodge, as described in the disposition in 2014 and as described in the Register of Sasines 1988, relative to I object strongly to the increase in access traffic created by the ncrease in residential accommodations from a single family home to 4 separate dwellings. this new plan will further increase the volume of traffic through and along this portion of private driveway to the detriment of private owner and which could result in a danger to other residents including the elderly and children who use the entrance for both pedestrian and vehicular access to their own properties and for the increase in potential blocking of said entrance as already suffered by the residents neighbouring this building site at 19 South Avenue when demolishing the existing house, prior to retrospective planning being granted. The replacement

single family home already granted permission and discussed with the owner of 19 seemed entirely suitable.