

# Broughty Ferry Community Council

Minutes of meeting held at Broughty Ferry Library on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017

**1. Community Councillors Present:** Adele McGrath (Chair); Joan Chalmers (Minute Secretary); John Watson (Planning Secretary); Stan Nutt (Licensing Secretary); Hugh Begg; Isobel McLean; Carolyn Forrester; Charlie Delaney; Fiona M Potton

**In Attendance:** Natalie Mackland (DCC Communities Officer); Nataliya Comerford (DCC Community Development Worker); Simon Goulding (DCC Licensing Standard Officer)  
PC Gordon Donald

**Ex Officio:** Bailie Derek Scott; Cllr Craig Duncan

**Members of the Public Present:** Jane Begg; J C Forrester; Doug McLaren

**Apologies:** Cllr Kevin Cordell; David Easson; Sean & Pat Moore;

## **2. Community Involvement in Alcohol Licensing**

Nataliya Comerford introduced herself and Simon Goulding, handing out information leaflets and booklets about alcohol and licensing.

(A copy of the leaflet and of the booklet will be posted on the Community Council Notice Board)

Nataliya spoke about the figures relating to alcohol harm in Dundee, about the number of licensed premises (explaining the difference between on and off sales). There is now more 'at home drinking' as 73% of all alcohol sales are now off sales and there is work going on to control the availability of alcohol by restricting new licenses.

Simon Goulding explained the role the Community Council can play where new licenses are being sought or where a variation in license is requested. Elected Members serve on the Licensing Board and they will decide on the local policy and its implementation. Any complaints about licensed premises will be passed to the Licensing Standards Officer who will attend and report on any necessary actions.

PC Donald advised that the Police also investigate where anti-social behaviour has been reported and any recurring problems are noted on their database. They liaise with the LSO as well as the Licensing Board. The Alcohol Policy Unit for Police Scotland is in Glasgow.

Simon advised that as LSO, he can insist that premises use plastic containers/glasses, install CCTV and employ door staff amongst other measures to ensure that the 5 licensing objectives are maintained.

These objectives are:

1. Preventing Crime and Disorder
2. Preventing a Public Nuisance
3. Securing Public Safety
4. Protecting Children from Harm
5. Protecting and Improving Public Health

During the presentation, the problems with receiving notifications from the Licensing Department were raised and Joan confirmed that a copy of the letter previously sent to the Department would be passed to the Elected Members in order that they could raise the matter with the Department. Adele thanked Nataliya and Simon for their interesting presentation.

### **3. Minutes of the last meeting of the Community Council**

These were agreed to be a true record

Proposed by: John Watson

Seconded by: Charlie Delaney

### **4. Matters arising from the approved Minutes:**

Joan advised that Bailie Scott had passed on a reply from Neil Gellatly regarding the possibility of widening the carriageway at the junction of Fairfield Road and Arbroath Road. He will ask traffic engineers to assess and estimate costs for this so that it can be considered for the capital budget in future.

### **5. Chair's Report**

Welcome everyone and thank you for coming along tonight. I will keep my report very brief in order to hear from John.

Since Ronnie Findlay resigned from the Beach Management Sub-Group, we have not had anyone willing to attend as a representative of the Community Council, therefore we do not have anyone reporting back. Is there anyone who would be willing to take the place of Ronnie Findlay?

- Fiona Potton offered to represent us as she had previous experience on this Group.

We have been inundated with emails this past month, which should have all been passed on. These included:

1. Community Litter Prevention Action Plan and the Litter Prevention Plan;
2. Latest news from the Community Councils website representing local communities;
3. Green Flag Awards;
4. Broughty Ferry Flood Protection update presentation;
5. Scottish Health Council Evaluation of Shaping Surgical Services Consultation;

6. The Dundee Partnership Community Conference on Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> November, where the topic that they will be focussing on is Participatory Budgeting. John Watson has kindly offered to attend as a representative of the Community Council.

As part of Scotland's Towns Week, the Academy of Urbanism

and its partners are holding a one-and-a-half-day event, the Neighbourhood Summit, focusing on changing neighbourhoods, following the success of the 2016 event

### *Streets Beyond – Beyond Streets*

Drawing from national and international examples, including contributions from some of the Academy's Great Neighbourhood Award finalists, the aim to explore the physical, social and economic attributes that make for successful neighbourhoods. Using lessons from 'established' exemplars, the aim to identify factors that can help regenerate existing neighbourhoods and making new neighbourhoods and estates more 'liveable'.

At this stage, partners and sponsors include University of Dundee, The Scottish Government, the Carnegie Trust, Sustrans, Scotland's Towns Partnership, CECHR, and Kevin Murray Associates.

### **Programme**

22 November (pm) Site visit to Broughty Ferry (Optional, but advance booking required)

23 November (all day) Presentations, discussions, workshops, lightning talk

To register your interest please contact: [h.j.b.gunn@dundee.ac.uk](mailto:h.j.b.gunn@dundee.ac.uk) or [e.douglas@dundee.ac.uk](mailto:e.douglas@dundee.ac.uk). Numbers for this event are capped, so please register your interest early to avoid disappointment.

Dundee City Council have written to advise they will be varying the parking restrictions on the north side of Gray Street opposite and adjacent to numbers 126/128 for the purpose of installing electric charging points. Any comments on this Order to be made no later than 6<sup>th</sup> October.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank John Watson and Hugh Begg, along with David Hewick, for the huge amount of work, time and effort that they have put into preparing the Proposed Local Development Plan 2. This has involved a lot of meetings, time and effort, in what is a very important plan for everyone living in Broughty Ferry for at least the next 5 years. Thank you for all your hard work!

## **6. Police Report**

PC Donald advised that the programme which they had been running in Dundee – ‘Dundee Safe’, was being extended to the Ferry. A ‘Ferry Safe’ initiative will be running at the weekends using preventative measures to combat anti-social behaviour.

A further programme of visits to all the Primary Schools will take place after the holidays to reinforce the message regarding dangerous and irresponsible parking.

## **7. Secretary’s Report**

Joan attended the Litter Prevention Workshop and will circulate the draft plan for consideration by members.

- Once again, please consider taking on the job of Secretary.

## **8. Treasurer’s Report**

None

## 9. Planning Report

### Planning Secretary's Report 1<sup>st</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> September 2017

During the above period, I examined 14 planning and 2 tree applications and only one deserved BFCC's comment and that was application 17/00715/FULL, with its supplement 17/00714/LBC, each concerning proposed alterations to St Marys Church in Queen Street. After considering the content of the applications and their accompanying documents it became clear that the proposed alterations to this, a B listed building in Grove Conservation Area, had become absolutely necessary in order to remove health and safety risks and provide new facilities within the church building itself to cater for the needs of all of the congregation and the public at large in the longer term.

The attached letter to the City Development Department informs of Broughty Ferry Community Council's firm support for the proposals and I ask the Council to agree its support.

In my report to the September meeting I drew member's attention to the fact that the planning applications for the lowering of the boundary wall at the Taycreggan site and the application to erect a dwelling at 11 Norrie Street, both of which BFCC had objected to. These applications have now been decided. The Taycreggan application was approved and the Norrie Street refused. I was not aware that DDC had issued a Dangerous Building Notice on the owners of the Taycreggan site, it was probably issued after a complaint or complaints had been received by members of the public. It had a significant effect upon the decision.

#### Proposed Local Development Plan 2

As members are aware, the Proposed Local Development Plan 2 prepared by the City Council has been made available for consultation. The Proposed Plan is of considerable importance since it will guide development city-wide for the next five years and beyond. The terms of the Plan have consequences for all residents of Broughty Ferry and the Community Council (BFCC) has a privileged position as a statutory consultee. With that in mind, you tasked a small group composed of the present and past Planning Secretaries, John Watson (JW) and David Hewick (DH) – assisted by Hugh Begg (HMB) to produce a draft response to be brought to Members for their consideration on 3<sup>rd</sup> October, with the resultant paper, with or without amendments, to be sent by the Chair to the City Council before the consultation period ends on the 6<sup>th</sup> October 2017.

Following a presentation by Alistair Hilton (AH), a Senior Planning Officer at the City Council, at the ordinary meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> September, it was agreed that a draft of BFCC's preliminary observations tabled at our 5<sup>th</sup> September meeting should provide a basis for informal discussions with the Officers of the City Council. At that time Members were invited to submit any views that they might have on the draft in order that they might further inform these discussions.

On 14<sup>th</sup> September HMB met with AH who was accompanied by Beverley Knox (BK) and, following that, a note was sent for their observations. On 27<sup>th</sup> September JW, DH and HMB met to consider these observations and a strategy was discussed and agreed. Alistair Hilton (AH) convened the meeting as scheduled on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September which was attended by JW, DH, and HMB for BFCC and AH and BK for the City Council. HMB led on behalf of BFCC in the exploration and clarification of AH's observations.

AH confirmed that the City Council had put in place procedural changes to the consultation process which, in its opinion, complied in full with the current intentions of the Scottish Ministers in achieving expeditious adoption of Proposed Development Plans across Scotland. Of particular relevance to the Community Council and its representations on the Proposed Plan the Council could accept small – and, hence, inconsequential – changes to the Proposed Plan which was the stated view of the City Council. All other matters would be left to an Inquiry conducted by independent Reporter(s) appointed by the Scottish Ministers to deal with representations by parties including BFCC. The process would involve the appointed reporters considering the merits of each representation in the light of the City Council's defence of its position. However, and this is important for those making representations including BFCC, in responding to suggested changes to the City Council's position as stated in the Proposed Plan, it is open to the Council at the Inquiry stage to indicate that it is minded not to oppose the alteration to the Plan suggested by the party making representations. Our experience suggests that

vague intimations of concern are not likely to carry much weight. For our final representations to have a chance of being successful they must be highly focused and make specific recommendations for the Reporter(s) to accept or reject.

Drawing these strands together, the paper which is attached to my Report, as your Planning Secretary, is the result of a lengthy and detailed consideration of the matters contained in the Council's Proposed Local Development Plan 2 as they appear to affect Broughty Ferry. From that mass of detail, and the discussions with Council officials, we have drawn out those matters about which we have specific representation about how the Proposed Plan might be altered with benefit City-wide and Broughty Ferry in particular.

**With all that in mind, I strongly commend the attached paper to you and ask that it go forward, over the Chair's signature, as the considered view of Broughty Ferry Community Council. It is, of course, open to any Member to make their own separate set of representations.**

**John J Watson  
Planning Secretary  
29<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

City Development Department

29<sup>th</sup> September 2017

Dear Caitlin Duffy

**17/00715/FULL and 17/00714/LBC**

**Proposed ground floor extension to west elevation of church, stained glass window removed to form access to extension and used to replace existing glazing on the south elevation to the rear of the church nave, formation of access ramp on Queen Street and the replacement of the church nave entrance door.**

**Location: St Marys Church, 164 Queen Street, Broughty Ferry, Dundee. DD5 1AJ**

The Planning Statement forming part of the documents submitted with the above planning applications is both clear and concise. It provides good reason why the proposed alterations to the Category B Listed building that is St Marys Church, are deemed absolutely necessary. The main entrance to the church is not friendly to those who suffer mobility difficulties or to the elderly. In Health and Safety terms it is a hazard that creates risk. It is alleged that some members, both of the congregation and the public now do not attend the church because of the hazards. The lack of accessible facilities currently available within the church is also a major factor that must be addressed in order to provide long term stability to the church's administration and congregation.

Before commenting on the detail of the proposed alterations it is necessary to visit the current Dundee Local Development Plan 2014, paragraph 9.34 Listed Buildings and Policy 48: Listed Buildings. The former states that "*The future survival of historic buildings depends on viable uses, effective maintenance and repair, and minimizing the impact of adaptation and modernization on historic fabric --- On occasion, it may be necessary to alter listed buildings to secure their continuing use*". Policy 48, b) makes it clear that, "*The alteration of a listed building will only be acceptable where the proposals have regard to the preservation or enhancement of its architectural or historic character*".

Picking up on "*On occasion it may be necessary to alter listed buildings to secure their continuing use*". The Planning Statement explains clearly why this is an occasion when **it is** necessary to alter St Marys Church to secure its continuing use. Policy 48, b) too is amply satisfied by the fact that no structural alterations will be made to the north and east fabric of the building itself and, what is proposed will alter the structure of the building only on the south west facet of the building which will barely be seen from the north. The proposals include the relocation of stain-glass windows which will serve to conserve them for the enjoyment of generations to come. The relocation of these windows, it could be argued, will also serve to enhance the rear of the nave on the south elevation.

The proposal for the main entrance doorway is sound in that the historic outer wooden doors will be retained but be left open whenever possible to allow the proposed new glazed inner door to provide direct visibility from within and without the building.

The proposed ramp, to facilitate better entry conditions to the church, at first glance seems to narrow the footpath by 950 cms. On closer examination of the 'Proposed Access Details' drawing the whole width of the pavement remains available to pedestrians, except at the east end of the proposed ramp the existing pavement is stepped up by 254 cms to accommodate the ramp gradient. Because the ramp will have a rail along its northern length it will be clearly visible to pedestrians. It also should be taken into account that the normal footfall on this section of pavement is low.

It is clear that in order to secure the continuing use of St Marys Church in the longer term the proposed alterations/additions are most necessary and Broughty Ferry Community Council would urge early approval of the proposals.

**This letter should therefore be construed as Broughty Ferry Community Council's firm support of the proposals as laid down in applications 17/00715/FULL and 17/00714/LBC.**

**John J Watson Planning Secretary 29<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

## **DUNDEE CITY COUNCIL: PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2: AUGUST 2017 REPRESENTATIONS BY BROUGHTY FERRY COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

### **Introduction**

Set up under the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, the Scottish Government has recently confirmed that community councils remain as the most local tier of statutory representation in Scotland. They are intended to bridge the gap between local authorities and communities, and help to make public bodies aware of the opinions and needs of the communities they represent. On planning matters the Scottish Government has provided guidance to planning authorities and community councils in PAN 3/2010 Community Engagement and PAN 47 Community Councils and Planning. While these documents are now of some vintage they remain authoritative.

### **The Process of Engagement**

The Community Council is grateful to the City Council for the opportunity to have the early engagement in the plan making process which is advised as good practice in PAN 3/2010. In particular, we welcomed the attendance of a senior planning officer at our Ordinary Meeting on 3 September and the subsequent consultations held with officers on 14 and 28 September. These have enabled us to communicate the observations and concerns variously expressed to us by residents of Broughty Ferry; and the further clarifications have resolved very many of the issues causing initial concern.

### **The Approach of the Community Council**

Section 25 of the Act still accords a central role in the determination of planning applications to the development plan of which the adopted Local Development Plan is an integral part. In short, in reading the Proposed Local Development Plan 2 we have borne in mind that a determination must be made in accordance with the policies of the plan unless there are material considerations of sufficient weight that they justify an exceptional approval. Accordingly, we have focused on the detail of the policies, its associated Appendices, and the accompanying Draft Proposals Map as they appear to affect Broughty Ferry.

However, we have also borne in mind the judgement that the intent of the policies must also be taken into account in the determination of proposals for development: the aims and objectives of the plan as well as detailed wording of policies are a material consideration (City of Edinburgh Council v the Secretary of State for Scotland 1998 SLT 120). Accordingly, we have paid attention to the text which precedes the policy statements observing, on occasion, that it might be helpful to make some minor adjustments to the drafting.

The Community Council recognises that the Proposed Plan following adoption must be implemented within the strategic context set by TAYplan. A complication in framing our representations in a consultation period ending on 6 October 2017 is our understanding that the current TAYplan was approved by Scottish Ministers on 8 June 2012 and it is that which provides the context within which, as a matter of law, the Council has been bound to frame its Proposed Local Development Plan. However, we further understand that TAYplan has been reviewed and a Proposed Plan (2015) was submitted to Scottish Ministers on 7 June 2016. In making our representations to the Proposed Local Development Plan we have been guided by the informal advice of the City Council that approval of the revised TAYplan is imminent.

### **General Context**

Broughty Ferry Community Council wishes to make it clear that we welcome the brevity and clarity of the Proposed Local Development Plan. It continues the journey towards a document which is user friendly to all parties, including the residents of Broughty Ferry, and aims to deliver desirable outcomes in a manner which is efficient and effective as well as fair to all concerned.

In that context, we have been provided with a statement of the Council's approach to monitoring the outcomes of the implementation of its proposed policies. As time goes by, we will be particularly interested in whether the results generated by the suite which includes the "policy improvement monitor", "the policy use monitor", and "the planning performance framework" can demonstrate that the Council's policies are fit for purpose and where blemishes are revealed these can be rectified in the course of development management.

**Broughty Ferry Community Planning Partnership Plan, the Development Plan and the Local Development Plan:** While recognising that some consultation has taken place, the Community Council remains concerned that the links between the Broughty Ferry Community Planning Partnership Plan, and the Local Development Plan- both of which are integral to a joined-up approach to the development of Broughty Ferry- are very limited. In short, "consultation" does not equate to positive action and that is what we understand to be the wish of Scottish Ministers. This is a missed opportunity which we hope can be progressed by the parties, in accordance with the wishes of Scottish Ministers,



during the lifetime of the Development Plan of which the adopted Local Development Plan will be an integral part.

**Sustainable Economic Growth:** Understandably, this section reflects the stance of Scottish Ministers towards economic development. However, the Community Council welcomes the assurances that the City Council remains committed to the wider concept of sustainable development and that its commitment to economic growth will not be at unnecessary expense of the policies towards the natural and built environment which are integral to the development plan: TAYplan and this Proposed Local Development Plan 2.

**Broughty Ferry as a District Centre:** We welcome the continued identification of Broughty Ferry as a District Centre under Policy 23, and also the reassurances given during consultation that the interests of our area will be fully acknowledged, and monitored, in the application of **Policy 7: Tourism and Leisure Developments and Policy 8: Visitor Accommodation.**

**Matters Relating to New Housing:** A review of matters drawn to the attention of the Community Council over the life of Local Development Plan 1 confirms the concern of residents about applications which have fallen to be considered under the terms of: **Policy 10: Design of New Housing; Policy 11: Householder Development; Design of New Housing; Policy 12: Formation of New Residential Accommodation; and Policy 13: Development of Garden Ground for New Housing.** We have noted also that issues of enforcement have emerged relating to some developments which have benefitted from planning permission. The Community Council supports the intent as set out in the introductory texts to each of these policies; and it shares the preference of the City Council for its criteria based policies and welcomes the reassurance that in each case a proposed development will offend the terms of policy unless all of the stated criteria are met. With that reassurance, with one exception, we are content to await the outcomes of the monitoring process before challenging the Council's view that this set of policies are, in all respects, fit for purpose.

**Sustainable Natural Environment:** We particularly welcome the suite of new policies which refer to the sustainable natural environment and also the planning authority's commitment to ongoing monitoring of their application. We further welcome the terms of **Policy 33: Local Nature Conservation Designations** including Broughty Ferry Sand Dunes, Reres Hill and Broughty Ferry Local Nature Reserve.

**Town Centre First** We welcome the continuation of Broughty Ferry as a District Centre nesting within the national, regional, and city-wide policy contexts. Turning to **Policy 27: Public Houses, Restaurants and Hot Food Takeaways** the Community Council supports without reservation the policy stance that new public houses will not be supported outwith the City Centre. As far as **Hot Food Takeaways** are concerned, a review of current provision in Broughty Ferry suggests not only an adequate supply of these facilities but also continuing difficulties associated with noise, odour, smell and hours of operation for residents in this area of mixed uses. Following helpful consultation with Council officers we are content to await the outcome of the planning authority's monitoring of the application of Policy 27 rather than lodge any objection to its wording.

## **REPRESENTATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

### **Housing Land Requirement:**

**We propose** that in paragraph 6.7 of the preamble to policy 9: Housing Land Release there be additional text to follow the third sentence in terms of the following words or similar: *The release of land at Linlathen (H46 at Appendix 3) may lead to further land allocations for housing in response to revised Housing Land Requirements set by the TAYplan Strategic Development Plan or other relevant factor. Piecemeal land releases will be unacceptable because they run contrary to the Council's commitment to a "design-led approach to sustainable high quality place making". With all this in mind, within the overall planning vision for the next 20 years to which TAYplan is committed, and compatible with its requirement to provide a generous supply of housing land within the period of that vision, appropriate consideration will be given to a strategic approach towards land release north of the A92 within the city boundary.*

In tune with that, **we further propose** that in paragraph 6.8 the phrase "*and greenfield land*" be inserted after "*brownfield land*".

**We further propose** that the land release at H46 to be in 2020 as scheduled in the predecessor plan rather than immediately on adoption of the Local Development Plan 2.

**Reasoning Taking** these three proposals together, in Appendix 3 housing allocation H46 "Linlathen, Arbroath Road" has been identified with an indicative capacity of 250 units. We agree with the Reporter who dealt with PPA-180-2049 and reported in April 2017, that the release of H46 will lead to proposals for further proposed developments north of the A 92. To allow incremental, piecemeal

development of this vicinity would be bad planning. Moreover, it would run contrary to the Council's stated commitments for this Local Development Plan: to develop a city having a vision of its future, achieved by a strategic approach, and leading to an outcome readily recognisable as a "City of Design". It is with this in mind that we suggest that the City Council should indicate within this Proposed Plan that it will start thinking about a strategic approach which will guide development north of the A92 for many years into the future. The area north of the A92 (currently within the city boundary), is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the planning authority to demonstrate what can be achieved by a strategy which demands the sort of development commensurate with its commitment to be known as a "City of Design". A glance at the Draft Proposals Map along with an associated site inspection is sufficient to see the danger of continuing to rely on development of this land by way of fragmented suburban housing schemes.

We would be disappointed if TAYplan with its stated commitment to a 20 year vision for the largest urban area within its bounds was to emerge as an insuperable barrier to preliminary thinking designed to avoid piecemeal development. Moreover, in the shorter term, a suitably drafted and caveated commitment to a strategic process may remove, or at least ameliorate, some of the deep seated, entirely understandable, and politically sensitive concerns of local residents as these have been made known to us regularly and strenuously. In short, it can demonstrate how planning can deliver the Council's commitment to a "*design-led approach to sustainable high quality place making*".

Moving on from there, the current proposal is that H46 be available for development immediately on adoption of the Plan. Contrary to that, release in 2020 of the former H72 (part of H46) was the conclusion reached by Scottish Ministers by way of the decision letter issued as recently as April 2017 by the Reporter with delegated powers. We are not aware of any material change in the facts on the ground as made known to Reporter; and, notwithstanding the advanced state of the emerging revised TAYplan its figuring was not brought forward in evidence to his Inquiry; nor was the Reporter's decision challenged within the required time frame. Accordingly, we suggest that view of Scottish Ministers as articulated by the appointed Reporter should stand thereby allowing further time for consolidation of development at the Western Gateway as well as some time to consider how a strategic approach to development north of the A92 might evolve.

#### **Proposed Amendment to Policy 13: Development of Garden Ground for New Housing**

**We propose** the deletion of criterion 5: 5) *that sufficient off street parking is maintained/provided with the existing house in accordance with its size;* and its replacement with 5) *that off-street parking is provided at the new housing in accordance with the standards set by the council and that these same off street parking standards are required at the existing housing in accordance with its size (Policy 56 and Appendix 4);*

**Reasoning:** for the avoidance of doubt, we support without reservation what the Council has in mind in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 as these refer to "Development of Garden Ground for New Housing". However, we are concerned that the criterion does not make clear what is meant by "sufficient"; that the term "maintained/provided" seems clumsy; and there is merit in a policy which refers to "new housing" maintaining the term "housing" rather than replacing within the policy with "houses". The proposed minor changes are suggested in the interests of brevity, clarity, and defensibility of determinations by the planning authority at appeal.

#### **Proposed Amendment to Appendix 1: High Quality Design and Placemaking.**

At point 2 on page 90 **we propose** that the phrase "local townscape" could with benefit be expanded to read "local townscape and its setting".

**Reasoning:** The proposed minor amendment reflects not only the wording of Policy 49: Listed Buildings but also the Council's laudable approach to identifying the appropriate boundaries for its designated Conservation Areas. The amendment is suggested to emphasise the continuity of the Council's intent that a valued townscape, albeit of less merit than a Conservation Area, should not suffer unduly from insensitive development in its vicinity.

#### **Proposed Amendment to Appendix 4: Design of New Housing under the heading "Suburban-Standards and the section on "House Type" with specific reference to "Flats"**

**We propose** that the minimum gross internal floor area be retained at 100sqm as specified in the currently adopted plan rather than reduced to 80sqm as proposed in this plan.

**Reasoning:** The suggestion fact that other cities, such as Edinburgh, whether by necessity or choice, have elected to run with lower standards than those required at present in Dundee does not justify a transfer of these standards to our city. If the previous standard of 100sqm. has worked well in the circumstances prevalent in Dundee, and we have heard no evidence to contradict that fact, we can think

of no convincing reason for an alteration which would allow a creep towards “town cramming” contrary to good planning practice in a city committed to a “*design-led approach to sustainable high quality place making*”.

#### **Proposed Addition to Appendix 9: Supplementary Guidance relating to Policy 51: Development in Conservation Areas**

**We propose** the addition of the following text or similar to follow the existing at Appendix 9: *Within the life of this Local Development Plan 2 it may be appropriate to provide further guidance on meeting planning policy requirements. That possibility will be kept under review. Thus, for instance, Supplementary Guidance in support of the application of Policy 51: Conservation Areas may be brought forward to assist in ensuring that, within designated conservation areas, all proposals for development will preserve or enhance the character of the surrounding area.*

**Reasoning:** In previous consultations, the Community Council has been able to contribute to the Conservation Area Appraisals for areas within Broughty Ferry. Subsequently, we have made clear our appreciation of the amendments to the limits of the areas designated and the quality of the appraisals themselves. We suggest that this example of good planning practice could be further enhanced by the issue of **Supplementary Guidance** directly related to implementing **Policy 51: Development in Conservation Areas**.

Proposals for development in designated conservation areas must be determined in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act (1997). We take the view that despite that fact, the inclusion of Policy 51: Development in Conservation Areas and its preamble is not redundant. Our understanding is that these are intended to give guidance to relevant parties about how the relevant provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Scotland) Act (1997) will be taken forward in Dundee. Our representation simply invites agreement that, as resources allow, there would be merit in providing some further additional guidance readily available in one place, in support of an existing policy and giving additional weight to its provisions in the adopted Local Development Plan.

While recognising the financial and other constraints under which the Planning Section must operate, based on our experience in Broughty Ferry, we suggest that drawing together the valuable guidance which is currently dispersed in the various Conservation Appraisals city-wide would be helpful in bringing to the attention of prospective developers, to affected residents, and other interested parties what is expected by the planning authority thereby reducing infringements. The costs of producing this guidance might well reduce the time consuming and expensive processes of enforcement resulting from failure of developers to recognise their obligations.

We applaud the wish of Scottish Ministers that the issue of a raft of Supplementary Guidance is to be avoided. We can merely observe that our suggestion would raise the number associated with Proposed Plan from a very commendable 3 to a still modest 4.

Signed by the Chair, Adele McGrath at the meeting of Broughty Ferry Community Council held on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017

- This letter was posted, Recorded Delivery, Wednesday October 4<sup>th</sup>. JC

## **10. Licensing Report**

None

## **11. Matters raised by Community Councillors**

Charlie spoke about the recent changes to the refuse bins/recycling and offered to have a look around the Ward to see if bins are in the best place and to advise the Environment Department if he thinks that any changes are need.

- Joan will email Janet Wade to confirm that this will be done.

## **12. Contributions from Elected Members (ex officio members)**

Cllr Duncan spoke about the wall at Taycreggan where he and Bailie Scott had raised an amendment at the Development Committee but were unsuccessful in having the height of the wall reinstated.

Cllr Duncan will chase up the Licensing Department on our behalf following no reply to the letter sent by Joan earlier in the year requesting email to both Stan and Adele as well as notification by post of any Licensing issues.

The proposals regarding Flood Defenses will go before Committee on 30<sup>th</sup> October with the costs and other details being made public one week in advance of this. We spoke about the expected public exhibition.

Speeding surveys have been ongoing on Monifieth Road at Reresmount Place and Cllr Duncan has asked that this is also undertaken at other places, particularly on Forthill Road.

Concerns have been raised about the withdrawal of the Crossing Patroller at Queen Street as pupils are not obeying the rules at the light controlled crossing. There have also been suggestions again about the possible closure of Camperdown Street at its junction with Claypotts Road.

Neil Gellatly has offered to attend our meeting to address concerns about the area.

Bailie Scott spoke about the soft landscaping at Millpark/Inchkeith/Inchcape and confirmed that works will be undertaken to address the problems.

Similarly, works at Gillies Park perimeter are ongoing.

The lighting columns in Albert Gardens, which were the last of their type in the area, have had to be removed and replaced with modern columns as they were beyond saving. Despite representations, the Department will not paint the single new (silver coloured) lamp standard in Duntrune Terrace green to match the other older columns.

Bailie Scott has raised the concerns of residents about the poor state of many street name plates but has been advised that there is no money set aside for repair or replacement in the current budget. He will try to ensure that this is rectified in future budgets.

Joan raised the matter of overhanging vegetation at the roadside at Sandy Park. Bailie Scott has spoken to Dougie Barr regarding this and he will arrange for a one-off tidy. The land is supposedly looked after by Greenbelt Group but there has been no success in getting them to respond to requests to take action.

Both Bailie Scott and Cllr Duncan attended a very successful event at Rosendael where a new lounge and dining room were opened.

### **13. Matters raised by members of the public (previously intimated)**

None.

### **14. AOCB**

Fiona Potton advised that a very successful Coffee Morning on behalf on MacMillan Cancer, held in St James Church last Friday, had raised £471. Joan spoke about the next event – Stand Up To Cancer – being held on Wednesday October 11<sup>th</sup> in St Aidan's, 2-4pm. This is an Afternoon Tea to raise funds for Cancer Research. As well as the teas/coffees and home baking, there is to be a fashion show, musical entertainment and a tombola stall. Tickets are available from the Cancer Research shop in Brook Street or at the door, priced £8.

**The next meeting will be on Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> November 2017 at 7pm.**

**Meetings are held in Broughty Ferry Library.**

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

JC