

# Comments for Planning Application 181431/DPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 181431/DPP

Address: 18 Home Farm Gardens Bridge Of Don Aberdeen Aberdeen City AB22 8BP

Proposal: Erection of timber decking along rear boundary with associated steps and handrails (retrospective)

Case Officer: Sheila Robertson

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Jamie Presly

Address: 16 Home Farm Gardens Bridge of Don

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I would like to strongly object and contest the erection of this decking.

In addition to required application for planning permission being ignored by the Property, the erection of the decking is in blatant breach of the Property's Title Deeds. Given the proximity of the houses within this (Cala) development, it is clear from our own Title Deeds that Miss Anderson is in breach of the burdens contained within the Title Deeds which clearly prohibit this type of construction without explicit written consent from us (as their neighbours) and in any event must not exceed 1.8m in height. Our written consent to the construction in its current form was never sought and the decking clearly exceeds 1.8m in height.

Not only is this a breach of legally binding document and council planning rules, this decking is a complete invasion of our privacy and our neighbours around us. Being direct neighbours this decking is acting as viewing platform into our home. This makes us feel very awkward in our own home and extremely reluctant to use our own back garden as there is absolutely zero privacy now with a view platform above, it looks directly into every single room at the back of our house. Besides from the privacy that we have now completely lost, the fact that the structure looks completely out of place is going to seriously damage our prospect of a resale of the house and will severely damage the resale value. From a safety perspective this decking is acting as an easy access way into the boundary for a row of houses which was well protect before with a 10ft wall.

The manner in which this has been handled is extremely disappointing, retrospective planning permission in this instance has only been sought as upfront planning permission would surely have been categorically denied.

This application should be denied with immediate effect.