

Sharon Dorward,
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

9 March, 2016

Dear Sharon Dorward,

**16/00252/FULL | Proposed Erection of 6 Flatted Dwellings | Land West Of
Library Queen Street Broughty Ferry Dundee**

This proposal follows on from two applications relating to this site which are due to elapse this year. They are 13/00166/PPPL (a health club to be built on the south of the site) and 13/00167 (extension of cottage to the north of the site, with provision of replacement windows). While no extension has occurred, the main windows have been replaced with multipaned sash windows, which have improved the look of the cottage.

The current proposal is to build five flats to the south of the site and to extend the cottage to create three flats and a garage for three cars.

This is an important and highly visible site in a conservation area that requires sensitive development. It is flanked by two attractive listed buildings to the east and west, a large unlisted traditional cottage to the north, and Queen Street (part of Broughty Ferry's Ambassador Route) to the south.

The site is also classified as Suburban in the local plan and therefore the development is required to comply with the Suburban standards in Appendix 3 of the local plan. There are three obvious areas where the development does not comply. Firstly, new-build flats are not encouraged unless there are appropriate material considerations. Secondly, the two-bedroomed flats 6, 7 and 8 formed from the extended cottage, are some 25% below the minimum gross internal floor area of 100 sq m required by Appendix 3. Even the remaining five three-bedroomed flats have gross internal floor areas some 15% below 100sq m. Thirdly, a minimum of 150% parking should be provided, but the development only provides 100%. Any argument to reduce the provision below 150% is weak, since there is no chance of any residential parking on the nearby streets.

The main criticism of this development, however, is the design. The new 3-story block of five flats is looks essentially like a brick barn with four square white-rendered entrance porches jutting out on the ground floor, whose flat roofs serve as balconies to flats on the first floor. Additionally, on the west side, and jutting out further from the porches, are two sets of external stairs with painted steel balustrades to provide access to flats 3,4 and 5 on the first and second floors. The windows are of no consistent design or symmetry (clerestory, vertical astragals, and horizontal astragals) and often associated with random patches of timber cladding. The main south elevation is asymmetric with a mish-mash of

finishing materials and features (brick, white render, timber cladding, oblong brick 'detail', steel balustrade, none of which is appropriate for a key position in a conservation area flanked by listed sandstone buildings.

Apart from the slate roof, the materials are inappropriate for the location. The main facing material for the walls should be natural stone. There should not be a highly visual external steel staircase in this key location. And maybe some attempt should be made to match the new improved traditional style windows in the main elevation of the cottage with those in any new-build.

Unlike the previous application to extend the cottage which maintained the original Victorian style the latest version adds another storey to accommodate flat 7, and an undercroft to contain 3 parking spaces. The addition of further timber cladding increases the deviation from the original style. An additional feature of the change seems to be some new demolition of a section of the protected stone wall in Camphill Road and destruction of the decorative cast iron balustrade on the steps down from Camphill Road. With the previous application the balustrade was to be retained.

The following aspects of **Policy 7: High Quality Design** of the local plan seem to have not been taken into account.

"1) consider and respect site topography and any surrounding important landmarks, views or skylines.

3) the design should complement its surroundings in terms of appearance, height, scale, massing, materials, finishes and colours."

It is considered that the present proposal adversely affects the conservation area and the setting of the two listed buildings. It is a combination of a damaging jumbled design and an overdevelopment.

This is a letter of objection.

Yours sincerely,

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

If you wish to comment on the above application, write to the case officer at the above address or send an email to sharon.dorward@dundeecity.gov.uk. By April 8.