



DESCRIPTION

The site is located on the south side of Midstocket Road, adjacent to the junction with Beechgrove Avenue and comprises Beechgrove Church; a category B listed building. The church, which dates from circa. 1900, is built in granite in the Norman-gothic style. It is T-shaped with clerestory, transepts and tall open tower in the north west corner. Attached to the east side is the church hall, which partially obscures the east elevation of the church. An octagonal baptistery adjoins the south west corner of the church. The main entrance is on the west elevation, facing onto Beechgrove Avenue. Internally the church comprises a nave and side aisles divided by pink granite pointed-arched arcades on polished granite columns and galleries in the north and south transepts and west of the nave. Many of the windows include stained glass. The church is surrounded mostly by hard surfaces, with low granite walls on both road frontages and higher walls on the east and south boundaries. There is a small landscaped area next to the south boundary which contains a copper beech tree. Adjoining the site are residential properties on Beechgrove Avenue and Beechgrove Gardens. There are also residences and commercial premises on the opposite side of Midstocket Road. To the south side of the church is a lane that leads from Beechgrove Gardens, which provides access to the rear of the properties fronting the west side of that street and east side of Beechgrove Avenue. The lane is approximately 6.2 metres wide.

PROPOSAL

Listed building consent is sought for the conversion of the church to 15 residential units, the provision of car parking some of which would be within the existing basement of the building and the remainder at surface level and the re-building of three garages. When submitted originally, permission was sought for 16 residential units with access to the underground car parking being from Beechgrove Avenue, but amended proposals were subsequently submitted reducing the number to 15 units, altering the car parking and access arrangements and incorporating some design changes.

It is proposed to provide 15 residential units (9 flats and 6 maisonettes), ranging in size from 60sqm to 185sqm. In total 1 unit would comprise one bedroom, 13 units would have two bedrooms and 1 unit would have three bedrooms. The conversion to residential use would be carried out entirely within the existing fabric of the church and hall. The nave and transepts would be divided horizontally to create 4 floors of accommodation arranged around a centrally positioned T-shaped atrium that extends up through the building to the roof. One flat would be self-contained with its own entrance. Four properties would be accessed from Midstocket Road, with the remaining properties accessed through a door on the main church frontage to Beechgrove Avenue. A new entrance for disabled access would be formed on the north elevation. The main entrance would lead through a timber-panelled porch into a large communal area and the atrium. Access to the upper floors would be by both stairs and a lift, leading to toughened glass walkways set within steel frames.

Where possible the existing windows would be retained. However, many of the windows would be replaced with purpose made timber framed windows with lead feature surrounds. It is proposed to remove the main east window, which incorporates Fleming stained glass, and relocate it to the newly named Midstocket Church, formerly St. Ninians on Midstocket Road. The existing doors would be replaced with timber framed units with glazed panels. The roof of the church would be completely re-slatted using salvaged slates and second hand slates to match. A number of rooflights would be installed in the roof of the church and hall.

It is proposed to form a car park in the basement of the church with a capacity to park 10 cars. A further 5 parking spaces would be provided at the side of the church, accessed off Beechgrove Avenue, giving a total of 15 parking spaces. A new vehicular entrance would be formed from the lane accessed from Beechgrove Gardens. It would involve the demolition of five existing garages, three of which would be re-built and the formation of a ramp with a maximum gradient of 1:20 that would lead down to a new opening into the car park. The basement car park would be formed under the baptistery and church hall. An area for storing recycling boxes would be provided adjacent to the entrance off Beechgrove Avenue. Communal wheeled bins would be located on the Midstocket Road frontage. It is proposed to reinstate the cast iron railings on the boundaries along both road frontages. The railing would be 1.4 metres high.

A planning application for planning permission has also been lodged with the Council (application ref. 090415).

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO SUB-COMMITTEE

This application has been referred to the Sub-committee because the proposal attracted six or more letters of objection from the public. Although the objections are primarily on matters relating to the application for planning permission, there are nevertheless issues that are also relevant to the application for listed building consent. Accordingly, the application falls outwith the scope of the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

CONSULTATIONS

ROADS SECTION – No observations
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH – No observations
COMMUNITY COUNCIL – No response received

REPRESENTATIONS

Following the submission of the planning application 6 letters of objection were received. The objections raised relate to the following matters. Although the objections are primarily on matters relating to application for planning permission, there are nevertheless issues that are also relevant to the application for listed building consent, which are listed below.

- Concerns relating to the construction of the ramped access and entrance to the underground car park
- Concerns regarding the loss of stained glass windows
- Concerns regarding the possible loss of timber panelling, original doors and tiled floors

Following the submission of amended proposals neighbours were re-notified. The most significant amendment was a change in the parking and access arrangements, i.e. access to the semi-basement car park would be from the lane off Beechgrove Gardens instead of from Beechgrove Avenue. As a result of the re-notification 13 letters of objection were received. As with the original notification most of the objections are primarily on matters relating to the application for planning permission, although there are issues that are also relevant to the application for listed building consent, which are listed below.

- Concerns relating to the construction of the ramped access and entrance to the underground car park
- Concerns regarding the loss of stained glass windows
- Concerns regarding the possible loss of timber panelling, original doors and tiled floors
- Concerns regarding the feasibility of constructing the underground is feasible

PLANNING POLICY

Aberdeen Local Plan

Policy 10 'New Uses for Listed Buildings' states that the Council will consider alternative uses for redundant listed buildings, which will permit better use and maintenance of the properties. Any alterations needed to accommodate the new uses should not destroy or seriously harm the essential character or setting of the building.

Paragraph 3.10.1 of the local plan states "In considering applications for alterations and extensions to listed buildings, the planning authority ensures that the proposed works do not adversely affect the appearance or character of the building.....it is important that alterations do not destroy the features of the building that make it worthy of listing".

National Policy and Guidance

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) is the statement of Scottish Government policy on land use planning and includes the Scottish Government's core principles for the operation of the planning system and concise subject planning policies. The subject planning policy relating to the historic environment is relevant material consideration. The Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) is also a relevant material consideration.

EVALUATION

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where a proposal affects a listed building Sections 14(2) and 59(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 places a duty on planning authorities in determining an application for listed building consent to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This is the primary consideration in the determination of applications for listed building consent.

Beechgrove Church is a Category B listed building that has lain vacant for some time. It is unlikely that it will be brought back into use as a church. Consequently, in order to ensure the long term maintenance of the building it is necessary to consider appropriate alternative uses. Policy 10 of the local plan encourages alternative uses for redundant listed buildings, provided the new uses would not destroy or seriously harm the essential character or setting of the building. There is general support in SPP and SHEP for the conversion of the church to a suitable use that would protect the listed buildings character and integrity and ensure its long-term maintenance and retention. Conversion to residential use is considered to be an appropriate alternative use for the church.

The conversion of the church involves mostly works to the interior of the building. The only external manifestations of the proposal would be installation of new windows and doors, the formation of the access ramp down to and the opening into the semi-basement car park, the surface level parking spaces, the installation of railings along the street frontages and the installation of a number of rooflights. The proposed external alterations to the church are acceptable in that the overall character, appearance and integrity of the building would be retained. Several of the windows and doors would be replaced. The replacement fixtures would be of a quality that would maintain the character and appearance of the listed building. The internal alterations would be quite extensive, mainly due to the horizontal sub-division of the building to create 4 floors of accommodation and formation of the individual residential units. As a result, the internal character of the church would be altered dramatically. However, this is inevitable where such buildings are converted to residential use. Considerable efforts have been made by the architects to ensure that a sense of being within a converted church is achieved by retaining as many original features and characteristics as possible. Much of the original fabric of the interior would be retained. The atrium would ensure that there would continue to be an appreciation of the internal height of the church. The removal of the main east window, which incorporates Fleming stained glass, and its relocation to the newly named Midstocket Church, formerly St. Ninians on Midstocket Road, is regrettable as ideally it would remain in place. However, it would not be feasible to retain it as part of the residential conversion. It is considered that the character of the listed building would not be significantly diminished by the removal of the window.

The alterations to form the underground car park are acceptable. The location of those works is such that there would be no significant effect on the character of the listed building. It is accepted that, although challenging, it is technically feasible to form a car park under part of the church. The reinstatement of cast iron railing on the boundaries with Beechgrove Avenue and Midstocket Road would improve the appearance and setting of the listed building.

In conclusion, the design of the proposal, both internally and externally, is of a high standard that would ensure the character and integrity of the listed building. It would ensure that the building would be maintained and retained in the longer term. The proposal complies with the aims of SPP, SHEP and the local plan in terms of allowing appropriate alternative uses for listed buildings and ensuring the long-term retention of listed buildings.

RECOMMENDATION

Indicate a Willingness to Approve and refer the application to Historic Scotland

Dr Margaret Bochel

Head of Planning and Infrastructure

40 Beechgrove Avenue,
Aberdeen,
AB15 5EJ.
28th July, 2009

0910495

Aberdeen City Council,
Planning and Infrastructure,
St. Nicholas House,
Broad Street,
Aberdeen
AB10 1BW

**Proposed Development at Beechgrove Church, Beechgrove Avenue, Aberdeen
Conversion to 16 Residential Units and Semi-Underground Car Parking**

Submission of Mr. Raymond J Nugent, 40 Beechgrove Avenue, Aberdeen

I hereby wish to make the following representations to the Planning and Infrastructure Department in respect of the above Planning Application presented by Denmack Ltd.

Whilst the plan seems to retain the overall integrity of the existing church building, I wish to make some observations, reservations and suggestions about the development which require the consideration of the Planning and Infrastructure Department and the Roads Department of Aberdeen City Council.

The semi-underground car park is a good solution to the problem of congestion of the surrounding streets. But, in my opinion, the entrance to this car parking is in a bad location. I have indicated the following difficulties and concerns:

The access road leading to the underground car park will probably incur a statutory no-parking section on either side of the access point on Beechgrove Avenue. Existing residents require on-street parking and I would ask the Roads Department to give due consideration to the length of this no-parking restriction so that it is not excessive to the point of being detrimental to the residents of Beechgrove Avenue.

The mature copper beech tree near the pavement on the south west corner of the church grounds together with the small garden should be retained as they are an attractive feature and, unlike the unsightly ramp, do not deter from the amenity of the area.

The underground car park may have a barrier. This barrier will be some 5 metres from my bedroom window. I would ask the Planning Dept to give consideration to the noise which will be produced at times during the night when the barrier is being raised and lowered. Any safety features such as a bleeper when the barrier is operating would be intolerable. Noise would be reduced by raising the level of the existing garden wall by 1 metre or thereby. Any harsh security lighting may also have a detrimental effect on the tranquillity of adjacent properties.

Pedestrians walking in a northerly direction along Beechgrove Avenue would need to be very careful when crossing as they will be unable to see any cars travelling up the ramp. The garden wall will obscure the ramp until they are actually crossing at that point. It would certainly be better if the ramp road curved away as in the plans submitted 2 years ago.

As the car park entrance is now even closer to my property, due consideration must be given to the not unreasonable expectation that the foundations of the garden wall and even the actual house of nos 40/42 will be undermined during the construction of the access ramp of the car park. This may give rise to subsidence of part of my property. It is also important to note that the undermining work will be only some 2 metres at one point, from the north elevation of the property 40/42 Beechgrove Ave. The contractors would be under an obligation to repair any damage sustained to the adjacent properties.

I have two solutions to the problem given above:

- (a) I would have the entrance to the car park on Midstocket Road at the bus stop. It is true to say that this street is much more congested and the bus stop would need to be relocated, but if one considers the underground car park at the Hotel in Huntly Street, the car park entrance that I propose is an option which has some merit. As car parking is not allowed at that part of Midstocket Road, there will be no issues about car parking of nearby residents. Furthermore, the ramp will need to slope downwards quite steeply after the line of the pavement into the church building but there will be plenty of space to accommodate it within the building. The architects will not be constrained to any existing floor plan so they can adjust floor heights within the building quite easily.
- (b) Purchase the garages and land in Beechgrove Gardens Lane, demolish the garages and create an opening for the car ramp at that location. This is probably the very best solution but it would require the co-operation of garage and land owners.

The windows of the existing vestry of the church overlook my property and any development of this part of the church will have a major adverse effect on my privacy. This was not a major problem when the property was a church as the vestry was rarely used. I would ask the Planning Department to give consideration to the possibility of amending the plans. I would be pleased if the planners were under an obligation to raise the level of the garden wall by 0.5 metre, or thereby, from the vestry windows to a point some 10 metres in a westerly direction. It would be necessary to ensure that any alteration to the wall was in keeping with the present construction i.e. irregular granite stonework surmounted by tapered granite coping. Alternatively, a number of evergreen trees should be planted strategically against the existing wall to act as a screen.

Yours faithfully.

R.J.Nugent, D.Sc.

Representations relating to the amended plans for the proposed development of Beechgrove Church

I am the owner-occupier of the upper flat, 42 Beechgrove Avenue, on the south side of Beechgrove Church.

So far as I can see, there are at least three amendments to the plans submitted in March of this year:

- (1) that 15, rather than 16, residential units would be provided by the conversion;
- (2) that the entry to the semi-underground car-park would be from the lane running behind part of Beechgrove Avenue and part of Beechgrove Gardens, rather than from Beechgrove Avenue;
- (3) that there would be a piece of 'private garden' (private to just one flat?) immediately to the west of the current vestry building.

With respect to (1): without having copies of the plans to study at leisure, it is difficult to grasp the detail of the change, but I suspect that it would make little difference to owners or occupiers of 40 and 42 Beechgrove Avenue.

(2), on the other hand, is a very significant change for both my downstairs neighbour at 40 Beechgrove Avenue and myself. As I understand it, the plan would be:

- (a) that on the south side of the church building there would be ground-level parking, accessed from Beechgrove Avenue, for four cars;
- (b) that part of the garden of 8 Beechgrove Gardens - a part which lies behind the row of five garages which currently abuts the end, east, wall of the garden here at 40/42 Beechgrove Avenue - would be included in the development;
- (c) that of the five garages the three nearest our wall would be demolished (or perhaps all five would be demolished, and the two most easterly ones reinstated);
- (d) that there would be one ground-level parking place roughly where the garage nearest our end garden wall currently is; and
- (e) that between this parking place and the two remaining or reinstated garages there would be a two-car-width ramp down to a semi-underground car-park accommodating something like 15 cars (I did not note the precise figure).

This is an unexpected amendment, and I realise that others are likely to have concerns about it; and it could make it easier than it is at present for a determined would-be intruder to get into the back garden here at 40/42. However, my main comment has to be that it would remove the serious concern I shared with my downstairs neighbour about the plans submitted in March of this year that excavation for a wide ramp on the south side of the church would undermine our north boundary wall, and might even affect the house here at 40/42. I note that on the amended plan the excavation, and thereafter the coming and going of cars thereby, would be several feet from our east wall. I trust that care would be taken nevertheless that no damage be caused to the wall by the excavation (and that the ramp would have a properly constructed retaining wall designed by a qualified

structural engineer) - and indeed that where, even if all proper care were taken, some risk would remain that damage might be caused to our property by any of the development work, a record of existing condition, including a photographic record, would be made beforehand.

The amended plans make no reference to the gap in our east boundary wall which, when a previous owner or owners of my flat had use of the nearest garage, allowed access to that garage through a door, which still exists, in the end of the side wall of the garage. On either side of the gap, brickwork attaches our garden wall to the fabric of the garage. There are indications that there used to be a gate where the gap is; so I imagine that the gap pre-existed the garages, and probably also the houses on Beechgrove Gardens, and the other houses on our side of Beechgrove Avenue, and gave access to a path or lane. If the development goes ahead, with this amendment, my downstairs neighbour and I would wish to be consulted with a view to agreement's being reached on the work to be carried out at this point; and we might seek to have access to the back lane via a gate at the gap in the wall. (I think this would be compatible with providing a ground-level parking place on the north side of the gap.)

As before, I would be concerned that any entry systems to parking places, ground-level or semi-underground, incorporated in the development would be quiet.

Like their predecessors, the amended plans make no reference to trees. They seem, however, to allow room for the beech tree which is a very popular feature of the Beechgrove Avenue frontage of the church to be saved; clarification on this point would be welcome. On the other hand, the rowan at the bottom of the garden of 8 Beechgrove Gardens looks doomed. Not only is it a very attractive tree; when in leaf it screens my back windows from those of 8 and 9 Beechgrove Gardens - and, presumably, theirs from mine.

Would the ground-level parking places be covered, or open to the sky?

(3) This proposed 'private garden' might be an attractive feature of the development.

I understand that, where the representations I submitted in March of this year to the first version of the current plans remain relevant following the amendments to those plans, those representations will be taken into account without my needing to resubmit them. Nevertheless, I attach a copy for convenience. I think that, apart from one or two remarks which relate *very directly* to the proposed location of the ramp, all my comments of March continue to be of relevance. As before, I am naturally concerned that no structural damage be caused to walls or buildings here at 40/42 Beechgrove Avenue, and am also concerned about the appearance of the completed development, and about its effect on such things as noise levels here, my privacy, and the outlook from my windows.

Patricia A. Clarke
6th August 2009

P090420

Dr. O. J. Robb

6 Beechgrove Gardens,
Aberdeen.
AB15 5 HG
5th august 2009

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re. Planning Application Nos. 090420 and 090415
Conversion of Beechgrove Church to 16 residential units and provision of
semi-underground car parking.

While I welcome the overall plan for this building and the retention of its external features I wish to lodge my objection to that part of the plan relating to access from the existing 'back lane' between Beechgrove Gardens and Avenue.

I note that this aspect of the proposal is not included on the documentation circulated to affected residents by post but is apparent on the different version within the planning department. This appears to be an underhand attempt to deliberately withhold relevant information from those affected. I therefore question whether the necessary notification requirements have been complied with.

This apart, my objections relate to 1. Right of access to the lane and 2. The effects of such access should it be granted.

The church site does not currently have access to the private lane and I question whether such access should be allowed. I believe that the lane is the responsibility of the owners of those properties currently having access to it and as one of these owners object to this change.

If the proposed access is allowed this would dramatically increase the traffic using the lane. Current use directly from the area affected by the plans is the intermittent use associated with three lock-up garages while the plans would involve activity from all 16 proposed dwellings. The proposal approximately doubles those properties accessing the lane and is likely to be accompanied by an even greater proportionate increase in vehicular use. This would have a significant detrimental effect on the structure of the lane, increase the risk of damage and accidents and adversely affect the amenity. I am concerned that the resulting increase in traffic using the lane would change it from a 'traditional' quiet back lane used by residents as at present to a routine access road. Essentially sitting out at the bottom of my garden I would be immediately adjacent to a thoroughfare which is an unacceptable change to me. Given the existing increased traffic and parking problems at the front of my property associated with the previous flat development on the former BBC site I fear that

increased traffic at the rear of the existing properties would render my property and those adjacent into little more than a large traffic island.

I am also concerned that increased use of the lane and potential exacerbation of current overflow parking problems within the lane would obstruct the existing access to my garage. I currently require 24hour access due to being on-call for the hospital.

I am further concerned about the potential consequences of the proposed access and semi-underground parking becoming a gathering site for people thus increasing the risk of vandalism, other crime and safety issues for those who need to use the lane.

I very strongly feel that access to the new development should be from existing main roads and not from the private lane as proposed.

I trust that you will give due consideration to these points which are of great concern to me.

Yours sincerely

Olive J. Robb

P090426

Aberdeen City Council
Planning & Infrastructure
St Nicholas House
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1BW

25 Beechgrove Avenue
Aberdeen
AB15 5HE

04 August 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Conversion of B-listed Beechgrove Church, Beechgrove Avenue, to Residential Apartments.

I am a resident of Beechgrove Avenue and have a garage adjacent to Beechgrove Church. I have no objection to the aims of the plan and in particular, if the semi-underground parking is feasible, then this project will work both for the developer and the local community. I would raise the following points:

- I would ask that Aberdeen City Council seek expert advice on the conversion of semi-underground parking within this listed building to avoid any unnecessary delay, expense, threat to the substructure of the church or other buildings, and loss of street parking for existing residents. The development should only go ahead if this semi-underground car park is entirely feasible within a listed building with no proper foundations.
- I entirely accept that the best place for the entrance to the semi-underground car park is from the lane off Beechgrove Gardens. However, this can only go ahead if the garages in that lane are entirely demolished, and then my own garage rebuilt, to make way for the runway into the church. Demolishing only a few of these garages is unfeasible, given the way in which they have been erected. As an owner of one of those garages there has been verbal, but as yet no written communication regarding this scheme. I would want Aberdeen City Council to state, in giving planning permission, that before commencement of any work, agreement must first be reached with all the parties whose properties will be affected.
- All necessary steps should be included in plans to reduce the noise level of cars entering and exiting from the semi-underground car park.
- All efforts should be made to retain the mature tree at the southwest corner of the property.

Kind regards

Yours truly

Sharon O'Donnell

P 090420

7 Beechgrove Gardens
Aberdeen AB15 5HG

Aberdeen City Council
City Development Services
St. Nicholas House
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1BW

04/08/2009

Conversion Of Beechgrove Church To 16no. residential units and provision of semi-underground car parking [TCD Architects job No 8103]

Sir

We wish to object to the proposed use of the private lane to provide access to underground parking for the above development.

On the copy of the location plan notice served upon us there is no mention of the garages demolition. Only upon viewing at planning office were we aware of this change to the plans.

The property owners which abut the lane are jointly responsible for maintenance, and repairs of the road and drains [Feu Disp. of 1937] On occupation of proposed development there would be unacceptable increase in wear and tear on the lane surface and services.

There are no footways separating our property from traffic using the lane, we have had collision damage within the past five years. Demolition of the asbestos clad garages and tunnelling work would concern us with respect to foundations of our property.

We also object on the grounds of outlook onto the entry area, four windows on our property overlook the proposed entrance.

Yours faithfully

Derek Stewart
Irene Stewart

P090425

5 Beechgrove Gardens,
ABERDEEN,
AB15 5HG.

5th August, 2009.

Aberdeen City Council,
City Development Services,
St. Nicholas House,
Broad Street,
ABERDEEN, AB10 1BW.

Dear Sirs,

Conversion of Beechgrove Church (TCD Architects - Job No.81031)

I would like to place on record my objection to the proposed development at 'Beechgrove Church, Beechgrove Avenue, Aberdeen'. Until recently I had taken those five words to mean that the entrance to the semi-underground parking space was to be in Beechgrove Avenue, which is considerably wider than Beechgrove Gardens. That certainly is the impression given by the planning application, but I have today been alerted to the fact that the Developers' intention is for entry to be via Beechgrove Gardens (already an over-used short-cut between Beechgrove Terrace and Midstocket Road) and the private lane which runs between the rear of houses in both Beechgrove Avenue and Beechgrove Gardens, which involves the demolition of three garages. This is not made clear, or even mentioned, in the application and puts an entirely different complexion on the matter as I consider this both impractical and undesirable for the following reasons.

The lane in question is not maintained by the Council and has long been regarded as a private road to be used only by the occupants of properties backing onto it, who are jointly responsible for the cost of its maintenance. It is narrow, constantly in use, often occupied by tradesmen's vans or workmen's lorries and, of course, the cars belonging to the occupants. These last, incidentally, have been known to suffer minor damage on occasion.

It would be pure folly to invite a probable minimum of 16 (possible maximum of 32) additional vehicles to share this space and would be very stressful for the occupants of nearby houses who would be subjected to increased noise at all hours of the day and night, more pollution from petrol fumes, and their pleasant outlook ruined. (Those of us who have lived here for some time have already had their lives disrupted for months and their views spoilt by the flats which were erected after the BBC's original property was demolished. I, for instance, was deprived of the BBC garden and got a brick wall in its place. Then, of course, the inevitable extra wear and tear on the lane's surface and future problems with subsidence, drainage, and so on. Who will pay for these? Inevitably our properties will become devalued.

Please take these views into consideration when reaching your final decision.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs.) Jane Calder.

Aberdeen City Council
City Development Services
St Nicholas House
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1BW

106 Midstocket Road
Aberdeen
AB15 5JA

4th April, 2009

Dear Sir / Madam,

After examining the plans which were submitted for the development of Beechgrove Church I was dismayed to see there were only 17 car spaces available for 16 flats. If I remember correctly there were, I think, 23 spaces in the original plans.

Almost definitely most of the potential residents of such flats will have more than 1 car per household which means that more cars will be seeking road parking.

This situation will only make an already difficult parking problem much more difficult....if not impossible.

Yours faithfully,

Lina D Marconi