

ADDENDUM 1 – 14.4.16

Item No: 5.1

Application No:	15/01934/OUT	Author	Maxine Ingram
Date valid:	4 December 2015	:	
Target decision date:	4 March 2016	☎:	0191 643 6322
		Ward:	Weetslade

Application type: outline planning application

Location: Land East Of North Villas And North Of Meadowbank Dudley NORTHUMBERLAND

Proposal: Outline planning permission for 150 residential dwellings including access (Updated drainage 4.1.16 and updated planting strategy 8.1.16)

Applicant: North Tyneside Council, FAO Mr Richard Brook Quadrant Silverlink North Cobalt Business Park North Tyneside Tyne And Wear NE27 0BY

Agent: Capita, FAO Mr Steven Lyttle Quadrant East First Floor Left 16 The Silverlink North Cobalt Business Park North Tyneside Tyne And Wear NE27 0BY

RECOMMENDATION: Minded to grant legal agreement req.

One further letter of representation has been received. Their objections are set out below.

Due to short notice and previous commitments I am unable to address in person at the next planned meeting and I have been advised to submit my concerns in writing. There are a number of issues I would ask the planning committee to consider.

-Access and egress to the site: Construction traffic will be routed through Annitsford. This access/egress road through the village is used for dropping off and picking up children for the school and extra curriculum activities held at the school and additional traffic onto Front Street.

-Residents will have to put up with the additional traffic noise and inevitable construction traffic mud and dirt and parking issues as experienced on the Gentoo development two years ago.

-At your consultation day I asked why a temporary bridge could not be built to the north of the development which would mitigate the risk of any road traffic / pedestrian incidents, the road system is already in place to the road system to the north but it has been stated that this is not an option for two reasons:

-Northumbria Council own the land to the north. I would have thought that councils have the ability work with each other to overcome this obstacle.

-It would be too expensive for the developers. I question the statement “too expensive for developers” without a study being carried out to ascertain the cost. Is it the responsibility of the planning committee to consider the profitability of a scheme

surely this is a matter for the developer as any cost of building the houses including any incidental construction costs would be passed onto the customer?

I find both statements are at odds with the welfare of the people of Annitsford including any new residents who will undoubtedly have to endure 12 years of disruption as I was informed at the same meeting that this is phase one of four each taking approximately 3 years each. I would ask the planning committee to reconsider the access/egress strategy included in the planning application to mitigate the above risks and comfort of the residents as there is a potential 12 year benefit to this amendment.

-School / Health Centre The planning application states that approximately £43,000 has been allocated for the school budget to allow for the addition intake and approximately £71,000 for the medical centre. I have contacted both and neither the school nor the health centre manager has been directly consulted can you advise what these monies are for and how these figures were arrived at and does the local community benefit from what are already overstretched services.

-Health and Safety: The safety directive from Shasun has changed as issued to all local residents January 2015.

Item 2 of the document states that in the event of the siren being sounded "Do not leave the house and do not go searching for absent family. Remember that they will be given indoor shelter somewhere else in the area".

Item 6 of the document states that in the event of the siren being sounded "Do not go outside your premises for any reason unless told so by the Emergency services, local radio announcements or authorised Company personnel until the emergency is over"

I would ask the planning committee to reconsider on the basis that in the event of an emergency this new development put's in "Harm's Way" another 150 families which is avoidable. After all would any member of the committee leave their children outside if in there was an emergency?

-Aircraft Noise and Newcastle International Airport Issues (NIA) : I cannot find any record of Newcastle Airport's objections to the proposed development on the NTC web-site and had to seek a copy of their objections through your planning officer and to date have only received their final comments. I will leave you to draw your own conclusions as to why NIA's objections are not published and ask that no further permissions are granted until the summer (June to September) noise study is carried out as requested by NIA. Capita are suggesting there is no need for expensive noise monitoring for the developer. I cannot understand Capita's involvement in commercial issues as their role is to produce an acoustic report not give their opinions on developer costs I would hope the committee agree that this is beyond their remit.

-Whilst Capita have shown in their Daytime Aircraft Noise Contours that the noise levels for the development are 57db the development area actually falls between 57 and 66db as shown on their supporting diagram what is not taken into account in Capita's report is the frequency of aircraft movements due to rise from 65,000 to 85,000 aircraft movements by 2030. If NTC is supporting airport expansion I firmly believe the planning committee should also try and mitigate the need to build

housing directly under the flight/glide path of an ever expanding airport. As air movements are set to rise more data should be made available to the planning committee to consider the impacts of the Newcastle International Airport's growth to this and any past / future developments.

-It is noted that NIA want details of any photovoltaic cells or micro wind turbines as part of the planning application as this scheme falls under Airport Safeguarding 15km zone and no planning permission is needed to install solar panels is this not a risk that needs to be addressed for this development. As this poses potential glare issues for approaching aircraft should the committee not commission a glare study to allay NIA fears.

-Noted that Capita have stated that attenuated ventilation and noise insulation should be included in the planning application so would consider that they are advocating that all properties that suffer the same level of noise invasion should have their insulation and ventilation upgraded due to the noise created by NIA business, can I ask we address this separately as to who should stand the cost of the upgrade to properties affected is it NTC or NIA or who we should contact to look the noise subject for people who live under the flight path.

Tree / Plant Maintenance: Can the planning committee please make sure that any planning permission includes for the maintenance of any trees, plants and shrubs and clearly identifies who is responsible? I have lived in Crofters Close for 23 years and the council have done no maintenance to the land to the west of my property and only cut trees back when either one of my neighbour's or I have complained about trees overhanging our properties. I have repeatedly requested copies of maintenance records/strategy for the land around the Wyndings without success. I would like to think that the trees will be looked after and not allowed to become diseased as identified in your report.

Post letter note: I have requested a full copy on Newcastle International Airport objections and have been promised this by close of business today but I have not had the opportunity in the time given for this letter to be included in the next planning meeting to read the documents I have been informed that NTC do not post third party consultation objections only the public objections. Can I ask if there have been any other third party objections that need to be made public or the planning committee need to be aware of?