

Beverley Knox,
Planning Officer
City Development Dept.,
Dundee City Council,
Dundee House, Floor 6,
N Lindsay St., Dundee,
DD1 1LS

Dr.D.Hewick,
17 Davidson Street,
Broughty Ferry,
Dundee, DD5 3AT.
01382 774288

25 July, 2014

Dear Beverley Knox,

14/00460/FULL | Demolition of existing building and erection of 7no dwellings | Redholme Gardyne Road Dundee DD5 1NH

We wish to object to this application for 7 houses to be built on what could be a most attractive site in a desirable location in Broughty Ferry.

Our key objection is the inadequate quality of design.

To illustrate the design deficiencies of this application it is useful to compare the design of the proposed houses with those approved in the Broomfield Nurseries site, 3 Albert Road Broughty Ferry (13/00209.FULL). Some relevant plans are attached.

Both applications are for a similar number of houses in brownfield sites in popular residential areas of Broughty Ferry. In neither case is the location in a conservation area.

The detached houses in the Broomfield application (Type A and B) can be compared with those (Type 2) of the Redholme (the plans may need rotating).

The Broomfield houses have interesting rooflines/dormers/porches and attractively designed windows and doors. The Redholme detached houses are narrow fronted, arranged in a terraced-like row, have utilitarian standard windows and doors, and basic roofs with a wedge protrusion. The Redholme houses seem to be of a cheaper specification. They seem even more basic than the estate houses of Clearwater Park, Ferryfields and Balmossie.

Although the present application may satisfy the minimum standards of Appendix 3 of the local plan (this needs to be checked however) its design is of a utilitarian quality. A further example of this is the fact that it has only car parking spaces, while the other developments mentioned have garages.

The attractive location deserves better, both in terms of the individual houses, but also with a layout that more appropriately integrates into the site. This may be more readily achieved if the number of houses were reduced.

We have other concerns as follows.

1. The south part of the site, while neglected contains some attractive trees that are subject to a Tree Protection Order. Surely some sort of tree survey should be provided? We also note that a large centrally located tree in this part of the site has recently been cut down. Was there permission for this?

2. There seems to be no provision for SUDS in the application

3. It is not clear what role the tree-covered part of the site has in this development as the individual gardens in the plans do not include this area. Is this to be a communal area or is it possible that more houses will be built in the southern part of the site? If it is to be a communal area some indication of the landscaping needs to be provided, as well as the boundary treatment particularly to the south. To be up to the standard of at least the previously mentioned estate developments, this should be of natural stone.

Yours sincerely,

D.S. Hewick [Planning Secretary, BroughtFerry Community Council]