

Paul Macari,  
Senior 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

2 October, 2014

Dear Mr Macari,

**14/00686/FULL | Erection of 1.5 Storey House in Garden Ground | Garden Ground To Rear Of 182 Long Lane Broughty Ferry Dundee DD5 2EF**

We wish to object to this application for the following reasons.

1. The proposed house will be in front of the main elevation of the donor house (contrary to the local plan) which is one of a pair of attractive traditional stone-built houses
2. The new house would obscure the street view of the pair of cottages and have an adverse effect on the conservation area. Currently these 2 cottages with their gardens can be considered a traditional unit. The proposed development will unbalance this unit
3. The house in the garden will permanently deprive the donor house of any possible future off-street car parking provision. Also the potential for a convenient access to the main door of the house (only a very narrow alley will remain) is reduced. There are also safety concerns if the premises have to be rapidly evacuated in an emergency.
4. The design is inappropriate for Broughty Ferry Conservation Area. There should be greater deference to the basic historic character of the whole conservation area. The proposed house, which would be in a prominent position, is too modern in design. Also PVC windows and cedar wood cladding are unacceptable, particularly as the latter does not weather well in a seaside climate. Natural stone and slate should be used to preserve the character of the conservation area.
5. The adjoining house (1 Cottage Place) should in no way be considered to set a precedent. It is an example of a form of development which would no longer be acceptable in this location today.

It is relevant to indicate that this application bears some similarity to one at 5 Esplanade, Broughty Ferry which went to appeal in 2010/2011 (PPA-180-2018). As with the present application, the developer transferred ownership of part of the garden ground in an attempt to make it available for a housing development. The appellant tried unsuccessfully to argue that this part of the garden was a gap site. Also like the present application, the earlier proposal for a house in a garden in a conservation area would have completely deprived the donor house of any off-street parking. As a consequence of this,

the more recent local plan gives greater protection to the parking needs of donor houses. Unlike the present application, the earlier development (where the appeal was dismissed) was at the rear of the house rather than in front of the main elevation. This additional factor further strengthens the case for refusal.

A photograph of the garden of 182 Long Lane, which was taken in April 2011, is attached to this message/letter. There is no sign of the wooden fence that is now present (and which divides the garden), indicating that it must have been relatively recently erected. The photo also indicates how the addition of a house in the garden (such as the nearby 1 Cottage Place) would adversely affect the amenity of the pair of cottages and be an unattractive visual intrusion in the conservation area.

Yours sincerely,

D.S. Hewick [Planning Secretary, Broughty Ferry Community Council]