

KEY INFORMATION

Ward Broughty Ferry

Proposal

Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of 4 townhouses and 9 residential flats.

Re- Submission

Address

51 Beach Crescent
Broughty Ferry
Dundee DD5 2BG

Applicant

Camperdown Construction
Limited
31 Hawkhill
Dundee DD1 5DL

Agent

Pask Architects
18 High Street
Newport-on-Tay
DD6 8AD

Registered

22 February 2002

Case Officer

Charlie Walker



Proposed Housing Development at Beach Crescent

Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of 4 townhouses and 9 residential flats. Re- Submission is **RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**. Report by Director of Planning and Transportation

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed development is of good design, scale and massing and will serve to complement and enhance the character of the conservation area. It will not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding residents and provides a good standard of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore recommended for APPROVAL with conditions

SUMMARY OF REPORT

- Planning permission is sought to erect a residential development on the site comprising 9 flats in a 5 storey building at Beach Crescent and 4 townhouses at King Street. The design of the development is of a contemporary quality and its scale and massing reflects the variety in this area.
- 7 letters of objection from local residents and 1 from the Community Council were received, the principal concerns being the design and scale of the buildings, overlooking and overshadowing of adjoining properties and inadequate provision of car parking. Historic Scotland in its informal comments has not objected to the demolition of the existing buildings and the Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland, whilst acknowledging improvements on previous proposals, remains concerned about aspects of the design.
- The proposed development is of good design, scale and massing and will serve to complement and enhance the character of the conservation area. It will not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding residents. It complies with most of the requirements of Policy H10 of the Local Plan and provides a satisfactory standard of residential amenity. Furthermore, although the development is entirely residential, it is considered that this form of development is appropriate, despite the terms of Policy EU27 of the Plan, due to the quiet residential character of the surrounding area.
- Consideration of this application was deferred by the April Development Quality Committee. This was to allow for a more in depth investigation of the number of flats proposed and the amount of car parking for the development in the context of Policy H10 of the Local Plan. The provision of parking complies with Policy H10 and the number of flats proposed is justified by the exceptional nature of the site and the proposed development.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to erect a residential development on the site comprising 9 flats at Beach Crescent and 4 townhouses at King Street. The proposed 5 storey building on Beach Crescent has 2 two bedroom flats on the ground floor and 3 two bedroom flats on each of the first and second floors. On the fourth and fifth floors is a very large four bedroom maisonette flat. All of the flats have generous space standards and either patios at ground floor or balconies on the upper levels. The building is offset by 1 metre from the Category B listed building known as Beach House to the west. Despite the fact that it has more storeys, its eaves level is similar to that of Beach House and the apex of its roof is slightly lower due to the deeper plan of the proposed building and its lower roof pitch. It therefore protrudes behind Beach House and obscures the 2 windows on its gable.

The height of the building varies so that the fifth floor section beside Beach House is contained entirely in the roof space and the elevation at this point has a 4 storey appearance. On the eastern section of the building, the section beside the boundary of the one and a half storey cottage to the east is 3 storeys high (2 floors above a pend). Windows have been angled to minimise overlooking and balconies are screened by wing walls.

The elevational treatment of the building is complex and its staggered building line projects forward of Beach House at the eastern side of the building. The roof treatment adjacent to Beach House is conventional and finished in grey tiles but the eastern portion of the building contains a curving monopitch roof of standing seam aluminium. The walls are finished in render, blockwork and zinc cladding.

The proposed building on King Street is 3 storeys in height providing 4 townhouses. At ground floor are 4 garages on King Street and the upper floors provide 3 bedroom dwellings with first floor balconies to the south. The design of this building is similar to but more conventional than the Beach Crescent building and the proposed finishing materials are similar although no zinc cladding is proposed and the

use of natural stone over the western section of the building is indicated.

Vehicular and pedestrian access to the Beach Crescent flats is taken through the pend on the eastern side of the building. This pend leads to a courtyard containing 9 garages (one of which is a double garage) and 4 parking spaces. 3 of these garages are underneath the King Street building and the other 6 are in a building along the western site boundary. The King Street townhouses have 4 garages underneath the building which are directly accessed from King Street.



Each flat and townhouse will have a balcony or patio area. In addition there is a large garden area in front of the Beach Crescent building open to public view and small secluded landscaped areas to the rear of that building and to the east of car parking spaces within the courtyard. Cycle parking facilities and storage areas are proposed under the King Street building.

A separate application for conservation area consent to demolish all the buildings on the site has been made (see Report on application ref. no 02/00129/CON elsewhere in this Agenda).

The applicants have submitted a statement in support of their proposals. In it they state that the design and accommodation standards of the proposed development are of the highest quality and appropriate for the conservation area. They state that the footprint of the proposed development is less than that of the existing site coverage and that the scale is appropriate for the surrounding area. They state that the development complies with the terms of Policy H10 of the Local Plan and that EU27 seeks to retain only non residential uses which are not detrimental to residential amenity whereas the current social club use has caused noise pollution and parking problems in the past. Finally

they have provided information on the impact of the proposed development on the gable windows at Beach House and state that they have been in negotiations with the occupiers of the affected dwelling with a view to removing this window but have failed to agree on a price.

Consideration of this application was deferred by the April Development Quality Committee. This was to allow for a more in depth investigation of the number of flats proposed and the amount of car parking for the development in the context of Policy H10 of the Local Plan.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site comprises the former Castle Hotel now used as Broughty Ferry Ex-servicemens Club at 51 Beach Crescent and a disused storage building last used as a pottery at 312 King Street, Broughty Ferry.

51 Beach Crescent is a 2 storey building facing Beach Crescent which has been much modified over time. Records show that the land was feued in 1808 and that the house was occupied as Ferry House in 1810. Its facade is rendered and painted white and its roof is slated. A single storey flat roofed function room extension has been added to the front of it. To the rear the building continues in an elongated form towards King Street. This section of the building is lower and similar in character to 312 King Street. The walls are harled and the slated roof projects over the walls with exposed rafters. There are also significant single storey flat roofed extensions to the rear of the building up to the northern and western boundaries.

312 King Street is a stone and slate building of industrial character. It also has projecting rafters and no openings on the north elevation to King Street other than vents. It appears to have been the stable block for 51 Beach Crescent in the past, but it has had its own separate curtilage for many years.

The surroundings of the site are residential in character, comprising either houses or nursing homes. The sweep of Beach Crescent forms a focal point in the Broughty Ferry Conservation Area and includes a

number of listed buildings (all the buildings between Gray Street and the application site are listed). Beach House lies directly to the west and is Category B listed. This is a large 2 storey over basement flatted building with attic accommodation also dating from the early 19th century. The ground floor flats are approached by steps from Beach Crescent and the basement and attic flats are approached via pedestrian access from King Street. There are 2 windows in the gable of this building facing the application site. There is a mutual garden area to the north of the building. Also to the north, on King Street, is a single storey house at 298 King Street which is attached to 312 King Street. Further to the west is the Category B listed former Orchar Gallery (now a nursing home).

To the east is a one and a half storey cottage and its garden ground at 71 Beach Crescent and a modern flatted block of 4 storeys at 316 - 328 King Street. To the north, on the opposite side of King Street, are houses and flats of traditional and modern construction.

There is a considerable variety in the scale of buildings surrounding the site ranging from single storey cottages to 3 and 4 storey buildings of traditional and modern construction.

POLICY BACKGROUND

The following policies of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 are relevant:

- 1 Policy H4 states that infill development should comply with a number of criteria designed to protect the visual and residential amenity of the area.
- 2 Policy H10 sets out standards for new housing developments. In August 2001 the Council reviewed Policy H10 and adopted new non statutory guidelines for new housing developments.
- 3 Policy EU27 allocates this area of Broughty Ferry as a mixed use area where there is a presumption in favour of non residential uses provided there is no detriment to residential amenity.
- 4 Policy BE11 requires new development in conservation areas to complement and enhance

the character of the surrounding area.

LOCAL AGENDA 21

The Councils Local Agenda 21 Policies seek to value and protect local diversity and distinctiveness.

SITE HISTORY

The premises at 51 Beach Crescent were originally constructed as a house and then became a hotel and latterly a social club. 312 King Street has been the subject of a number of recent applications including application ref. no D23686 which was a refusal of permission for a restaurant, office and flat in February 1999. The reasons for refusal related to contravention of Policies LT8 and EU27 of the Local Plan with specific reference to noise and parking issues.

In June 2000 planning permission and conservation area consent to demolish all the buildings on the site and erect a 45 bedroom hotel were refused (application ref. nos. D24456 and DS00170 refer). The reasons for refusal included the overdevelopment of the site and the visual impact on the conservation area and adjoining listed buildings, adverse impact on residential amenity (due to overshadowing, overlooking and noise) and inadequate parking provision.

In April 2001 applications for a housing development on this site and conservation area consent to demolish the existing buildings were withdrawn by the applicants before they could be determined by the Committee (applications ref. nos. D25105 and DS00176 refer). The planning application involved the demolition of all the buildings on the site and the erection of new buildings on Beach Crescent and King Street of a design not dissimilar to the current proposals. The main differences are that the current proposals involve 2 less flats in the Beach Crescent building (with a resulting lessening in the height and scale of the proposed building), a 1 metre gap is now proposed between the proposed Beach Crescent building and Beach House to the west, access to most of the development is from Beach Crescent (as opposed to King Street in the previous application) and garages are proposed for every dwelling and

cycle parking for the overall development. The previous application (D25105) had been recommended for refusal on grounds of overdevelopment of the site, adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, contravention of Policy H10 with particular reference to car parking and contravention of Policy EU27 by reason of the failure to provide non residential uses on the site. The application for conservation area consent was also recommended for refusal as insufficient justification had been provided for the demolition of the buildings and there was not an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site. As previously stated the applications were withdrawn before they could be considered by the Committee.

In December 2001 an application to change the use of the social club on Beach Crescent to a public house was refused on grounds that the proposal would contravene Policy EU27 due to the adverse impact on residential amenity.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Statutory neighbour notification was carried out and the proposal was advertised as affecting the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings as well as contravening Policies H10 and EU27 of the Local Plan.

7 letters were received (copies available for inspection in the Members Lounges). The principal grounds of objection are:

- 1 Inappropriate design, scale and finishing materials for a site within a conservation area and adjoining listed buildings.
- 2 Overlooking and overshadowing of adjoining properties and particularly a gable window at Beach House.
- 3 Inadequate provision of car parking and loss of parking spaces on King Street.

The issues raised in these letters are considered in the Observations section of this Report.

CONSULTATIONS

The Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland considers that there have

been improvements to the design of the development compared with previous proposals but it is still concerned about a number of design matters. It considers that the Beach Crescent building should follow the curve of Beach Crescent, that its roof is too complex and it dislikes the large flat roof to the rear of this building. It considers the courtyard area to be quite tight both in terms of the parking areas and the small areas devoted to amenity space. It considers that the landscaping and treatment of this area is very important.

Broughty Ferry Community Council objects to the application due to the size and design of the buildings and adverse impact they would have on the conservation area and nearby listed buildings, the impact on the gable windows at Beach House, because the development contravenes Policy EU27 and because of the amount of flats proposed and because there is inadequate car parking. It considered that the observations and proposed reasons for refusal in the Director of Planning and Transportation's Report on application D25105 are just as applicable to the current application.

Historic Scotland has informally commented on the proposed development. It states that although the existing buildings are of interest, the sun lounge extension does considerable harm to the character of the conservation area, so on balance it is willing to accept a replacement development if of sufficient quality to make a positive enhancement to the character of the conservation area. It considers that a pastiche solution is not required and that the form of the new building successfully continues the pattern set by the crescent. It dislikes the use of grey tiles and suggests slate or metal standing seams where tiles are indicated.

OBSERVATIONS

The determining issues for the Committee in this instance are:

- 1 Is the design and massing of the proposed building satisfactory in the context of the adjoining listed buildings and the Broughty Ferry Conservation Area and the requirements of Policy BE11 of the Local Plan?

- 2 Does the development comply with Policies H4 and H10 of the Local Plan and in particular will the development result in an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity by reason of overshadowing and overlooking of adjoining properties?
- 3 Is the development of the site for housing acceptable in principle, taking into account Policy EU27 of the adopted Local Plan?

Scale and massing of the buildings:

It is considered that the scale and massing of the proposed buildings are acceptable for this prominent site in the Broughty Ferry Conservation Area adjacent to a number of listed buildings. The existing pattern of development at Beach Crescent forms a gentle curve along the waterfront. The scale of the building varies from substantial buildings such as the former Orchar Gallery to small cottages such as the one to the east of the application site. There is a similar pattern of development on King Street. It is considered that the Beach Crescent frontage is capable of taking a substantial building without detriment to the visual amenity of the area. Although the proposed development is up to 5 stories high at Beach Crescent, its scale is similar to that of Beach House to the west. It also steps down at its eastern end so that its height of 4 and then 3 storeys creates an acceptable relationship with the adjoining cottage to the east. In fact the height relationship of the proposed flats to this house is much less disparate than that of the existing tenement at 85-95 Beach Crescent and that house. The reduction in scale of the proposed Beach Crescent building when compared with the previous proposals contributes significantly to providing an acceptable relationship in terms of both scale and massing with the surrounding buildings.

The position at King Street is similar. The proposed 3 storey townhouse development is much lower than the modern flats at 316-328 King Street and higher than the cottage at 298 King Street. However taking into account the varied building heights and massing along King Street, it is not considered that the scale and massing of the proposed development is unacceptable.

For the entire development it is considered that the proposed scale and massing is also appropriate in the context of the requirement in Policy BE11 of the adopted Local Plan to complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area and with the statutory duties to have regard to the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings in the making of determinations on planning applications.

Design of the buildings: It is considered that the design of the proposed Beach Crescent building is innovative and will present an attractive frontage on this important site. The intricate modelling of the building along with the extensive use of glazing and choice of finishing materials will produce a building of exceptional quality that will serve to enhance the appearance of the conservation area. The reduction in scale from the previous proposals coupled with the simplification of the roof treatment have served to produce a building that is much more appropriate for the site. The Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland continues to have concerns about the development. In general they have not criticised the height or massing of the buildings but are concerned that the footprint of the Beach Crescent building does not follow the curve on the street. However, the proposed building pays much greater respect to this building line than the existing building proposed to be demolished and does not stray forward of the line set by the existing buildings to the east and west of the site. Their concerns about the complexity of the roof are acknowledged but it is also noted that the roof is less complex than the previous proposals and the flat roof area is simply an acknowledgement that the height of the eastern part of the building should not overly dominate the cottage to the east. The courtyard parking area does not create any circulation difficulties for vehicles and whilst it is acknowledged that the size of this space is restricted, each dwelling will have private amenity space provided by a patio or balcony. In addition it is agreed that the hard and soft landscaping of this area should be to a high specification.

Contrary to the views expressed by some objectors, it is not considered appropriate to try to develop the site

with a "pastiche" building as though dating from the Victorian era. Both Historic Scotland and the Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland agree with this viewpoint.

The design of the proposed King Street townhouses is of a different character, these buildings being more domestic in scale. The use of natural stone on the western gable and on the ground floor of these buildings will help to integrate them with the adjoining stone cottage to the west. Although it is accepted that it is difficult in design terms to provide 4 garages on the King Street elevation, it is considered that in this case a satisfactory elevation has been produced.

For the entire development it is considered that the proposed design is appropriate in the context of the requirement in Policy BE11 of the adopted Local Plan to complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area and with the statutory duties to have regard to the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings in the making of determinations on planning applications.

Policy H4 and the impact on residential amenity: Concerns about overlooking and overshadowing of adjoining properties have featured in the objections to this planning application. The previous proposals for this development directly adjoined Beach House thereby obscuring 2 gable windows. The current application sets the proposed Beach Crescent building 1 metre back from the boundary. It is considered that the gable window at the ground floor flat, which is already substantially overshadowed by the existing buildings on this site will not be affected by the proposed development. However the gable window of the upper floor flat will be affected and the occupiers of this dwelling have objected to the development. It is considered that although there will be overshadowing of this window, this can only be avoided by restricting any development on the application site to a height of 3 storeys. If this gable window served a habitable room then it is considered that it would be appropriate to impose such a restriction on the development. However, the window in question serves a stair way and it is not considered that the loss to residential

amenity as a result of the overshadowing of this window would be such as to justify a refusal of planning permission.

Other than that gable window it is not considered that the proposed development will lead to any significant overshadowing of adjoining properties. At the eastern end of the proposed Beach Crescent building it drops down to 3 stories at the boundary and the cottage at 71 Beach Crescent is set back an average of 6 metres from its boundary. At King Street, the cottage at no 298 already directly adjoins a substantial building on the application site which extends to the south in much the same manner as the proposed buildings on King Street. The residents of the modern flats at 316-328 King Street have also objected on grounds of overshadowing. The principal windows on these flats face north and south. The south facing windows principally overlook the garden of the cottage at 71 Beach Crescent. They are sufficiently distant and angled away from the proposed Beach Crescent building (some 21 metres from the 5 storey section and 12.5 metres from the 3 storey section of the proposed building) that there should not be a problem with overshadowing. There are also west facing windows on the gable of the flats serving kitchens. Although these windows are just over 4 metres from the gable of the proposed King Street townhouses, the proposed townhouses are mainly to the north of the windows. There will therefore be no impact on daylight and direct sunlight will only be affected at the very end of the day when the sun is setting. In addition kitchens are not considered to be habitable rooms for the purposes of daylight protection.

In terms of overlooking, because the site is in a densely built up area there is a considerable degree of overlooking at present. In particular the cottage and its garden ground at 71 Beach Crescent is already substantially overlooked by the flats at 316-328 King Street and the cottage at 298 King Street is overlooked by the flats in Beach House. It is considered that the proposed development will not lead to any unacceptable overlooking. Windows on the eastern elevation of the proposed Beach Crescent building are angled away from adjoining properties and there are no windows on

the western gable. South facing windows are sufficiently distant and angled away from the flats at 316-328 King Street as to avoid any unacceptable overlooking. Concerns about overlooking from first floor balconies on the proposed King Street townhouses are overcome by the provision of screen wing walls.

In conclusion it is considered that the development will not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity and therefore complies with Policy H4 of the adopted Plan.

Policy H10 standards: These standards in the adopted Local Plan permit flats at this location. The proposed flatted development complies with all the standards set out in Policy H10 with the sole exception that no outdoor drying areas are indicated. The proposed townhouses comply with the standards for flats but fail to provide 50 sq. metres of garden ground.

Although technically there is room to cordon off a small area to provide outdoor drying facilities, it is considered that the nature of the development and the layout of the site do not lend themselves to the provision of these facilities. Indeed if residents were to require outdoor drying facilities it is likely that the use of the balconies and patio areas would be a more useful solution than a location within the courtyard area. It is not considered that in these circumstances the development should be refused for the failure to provide outdoor drying facilities. If Members feel that such provision is appropriate then a planning condition to this effect could be imposed. In terms of the gardens for the town houses, each unit will be provided with an attractive south facing patio and whilst they do not meet the garden size standard, it is considered that an adequate level of amenity is provided for these town houses in this central location.

In areas where car parking is difficult 130% parking should be provided and in this case the provision is just in excess of this figure. The issue of parking has been the subject of objections to this development. It is considered that the level of parking proposed is sufficient for this scale of development. Although the dwellings can be considered as being in the

luxury bracket, they have a very central location where it would not be unreasonable to expect 1 car per unit, with the additional on site parking catering for any additional demand. In addition, as vehicular access to the development is from Beach Crescent, any overspill parking is likely to occur at this location where there is much greater provision than in King Street. Objectors are concerned that parking problems are likely to be increased by the loss of parking on King Street due to the provision of garages for the town houses. However at most 3 spaces would be lost on King Street and this should be balanced against any on street parking generated by the use of the existing buildings on both King Street and Beach Crescent.

In conclusion, although the proposed development fails to meet the Policy H10 standards on the provision of outdoor drying areas for the flats and 50 sq. metres of garden ground for the townhouses it is considered that an adequate standard of residential amenity is provided, particularly when account is taken of the character and location of the site.

More recently in August 2001 the Council agreed a review of Policy H10 to emphasise concerns about over provision of flatted development. This Review did not formally amend the adopted Local Plan but expresses the Council's desires with regard to the provision of new housing.

For central Broughty Ferry, if the site is for less than 12 units then these can be all flatted. **As the proposed development is for 13 dwellings it is considered as a larger development site in terms of these revised guidelines. For larger sites there is no general presumption in favour of flats on the site but the guidelines state "flats will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where site specific circumstances dictate".** In this case it is considered that this site is an exceptional one where there is a justification for the form of development proposed. A suburban style of housing would be totally inappropriate at this location where design requirements can only be satisfied by development of a substantial scale and massing. In addition the Council's review of Policy H10 stressed that if new flats were to be provided then they should be of an exceptionally high standard. In this

case, as has been pointed out above, the flats have very generous internal space standards with individual balconies and patios and a lift is proposed for the flats. It is considered that both the nature of the site and the quality of accommodation proposed justifies the approval of this development even taking into account the review of Policy H10.

It is also worth mentioning that the proposed development merges 2 sites which were in separate ownership without any interconnection. The revised Policy H10 guidelines could permit up to 12 flats on each of these sites although obviously such a scale of development would contravene other standards on parking and amenity space.

In these circumstances, because the site is considered to be an exceptional one, it is not considered that the number of flats proposed breaches Policy H10 as reviewed by the non statutory guidelines.

In terms of the provision of car parking, Policy H10 of the adopted Local Plan has not been altered by the more recent review. The issue of parking for the development has been considered in previous paragraphs. The provision for the 9 flats exceeds the Policy H10 requirement for sites where there are parking difficulties in surrounding streets. For the 4 town houses only 1 space per dwelling is required and this is provided by the development. In total 13 units are proposed and garaging for 14 vehicles plus 4 visitor spaces are proposed. This is just in excess of the Policy H10 requirement for sites with parking difficulties and is certainly considered to be appropriate for such a central site.

Policy EU27: This policy contains a presumption against residential development on existing non residential sites in this mixed use area. It is accepted that the character of the surrounding area is entirely residential, including a number of residential homes. Proposals for commercial development at both 51 Beach Crescent and 312 King Street have been refused in the past due to residential amenity considerations. It is not considered that the loss of the existing social club would lead to a deterioration in the character or quality

of the area. It is further considered that an entirely residential development on the site would be acceptable despite the terms of Policy EU27.

The demolition of the existing buildings is considered in more detail in the report on the accompanying application to demolish these buildings elsewhere in this agenda (application ref. no 02/00129/CON).

Design:

It is considered that the design of the proposed Beach Crescent building is innovative and will present an attractive frontage on this important site. The intricate modelling of the building along with the extensive use of glazing and choice of finishing materials will produce a building of exceptional quality that will serve to enhance the appearance of the conservation area. The design of the proposed King Street townhouses is of a different character, these buildings being more domestic in scale. The use of natural stone on the western gable and on the ground floor of these buildings will help to integrate them with the adjoining stone cottage to the west.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development provides a good design, scale and massing and will serve to complement and enhance the character of the conservation area.

It will not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding residents. It complies with most of the requirements of Policy H10 of the Local Plan and provides a satisfactory standard of residential amenity. Finally although the development is entirely residential, it is considered that this form of development is appropriate, despite the terms of Policy EU27 of the Plan, due to the quiet residential character of the surrounding area.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:-

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced

- within five years from the date of this permission.
- 2 Samples of the finishing materials proposed to be used shall be submitted to the Council for approval and if approved the development shall be carried out only in accordance with such approved samples.
 - 3 Where it is indicated on the approved drawings that roofs are to be finished in "charcoal grey plain concrete roof tiles" then these roof areas shall be finished in natural slate to the satisfaction of the Council.
 - 4 Details of the hard and soft landscaping of the site including timescales for implementation, the treatment of the garage roof area and provisions for maintenance of landscaping shall be submitted to the Council for approval before any development is commenced and if approved the development shall be carried out only in full accordance with such approved details.
 - 5 Any trees or shrubs planted in terms of condition 4 above which are removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted in terms of condition 4.

Reason

- 1 To comply with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
- 2 In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
- 3 In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
- 4 To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance of the development.
- 5 To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance of the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.