# **Comments for Planning Application 161769/DPP**

## **Application Summary**

Application Number: 161769/DPP

Address: Ardbeck House 384 North Deeside Road Milltimber Aberdeen AB13 0AJ

Proposal: Erection of indoor tennis court

Case Officer: Roy Brown

#### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr Stuart Wyles

Address: 91 St Ronans Drive Peterculter

### **Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:We are writing to express concerns over the planning application to erect an indoor tennis court (Planning Ref: 161769/DPP). The application proposes to erect a building of significant size near to adjacent properties on the north and west boundaries.

#### Our concerns are as follows:

- 1. The proposal is on a much bigger scale than existing neighbouring properties adjacent on the north and west sides of the applicant's plot. The scale and siting of the proposal will have adverse impact on amenity to adjacent neighbours on said north and west boundaries in terms of being visually overbearing / dominant, out-of-scale with surrounding properties, and may introduce a feeling of enclosure.
- 2. The scale of the proposed building may cast shadow beyond the boundary of the applicant's plot to lie within the boundary of adjacent properties (into gardens, outbuildings), so have adverse impact on neighbours' own private amenity.
- 3. There are a large number of protected trees which would need to be felled to make way for the proposed building. The proposed re-planting scheme does not appear to be on the same scale as the proposed tree removal, so not re-establishing this valuable amenity to immediate neighbours and wider local community. Nor does the re-planting seem to satisfactorily seek to re-balance the out-of-scale dominance of the proposed building exposed to the north and west boundaries. It appears from location maps (Ref: 161554/TPO) that some proposed tree re-planting is located on, or very near, the proposed new building and so under-mining accuracy and confidence in the re-planting proposal. As part of the application, or any amended application that may be put forward, a credible planting scheme must be presented making use of trees /shrubs to re-establish this

valuable neighbour amenity and to screen any new development from adjacent properties on the north and west boundaries.

4. The proposed building is substantial and may subsequently be used for commercial and/or non-commercial purposes. This will introduce noise and nuisance to a well-established family residential area, and therefore detrimental to local amenity.

We object to the proposal on the concerns listed above.

Stuart Wyles Carole Noble