

***PLEASE NOTE VENUE**

Ouseburn Management Board – Special Meeting

Tuesday 26 August 2008 at 4.30 pm

**Meeting to be held at Ouseburn Regeneration Centre , Spillers Quay, Ouseburn ,
Newcastle upon Tyne**

Contact Officer: Steve Laws – Telephone 211 5118

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Planning Applications received in the Lower Ouseburn Valley**
Report of Director of Strategic Housing, Planning and Transportation
(attached)

Ouseburn Management Board

26 August 2008

Planning Applications received in the Lower Ouseburn Valley

Report by: Director of Strategic Housing, Planning and Transportation.

Ward Implications: Byker/Ouseburn

For Information		
-----------------	--	--

1. Synopsis

1.1 This report provides an update of planning applications in the Ouseburn Valley Regeneration Area.

2. Recommendation

2.1 Members are recommended to receive this report for information.

3. Background

3.1 The attached appendix provides a schedule of planning applications that have been received for the Ouseburn Regeneration Area.

The planning applications can be viewed via Newcastle City Councils web site www.newcastle.gov.uk and typing 'planning applications' in the search box.

4. Legal Implications

4.1 None.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 None.

6. Schedule of Planning Applications

6.1 See attached Appendix.

Background Papers

1. Ouseburn Regeneration Strategy.
2. Individual applications are held in case files. File reference numbers are indicated on the attached schedule.

Contact Officer:

David Cross, phone no. 0191 275 5610
Planning Officer

**Schedule of Observations of Ouseburn Management Board and Decisions
on Planning Applications**

Item	Observations, Recommendation and Date of Observations of Ouseburn Management Board	Status
<p>2008/1275/01/DET Former Winn Products Engineers Ltd, 17 Stoddart Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 1AN Erection of a 7 storey building for student accommodation (94 units) comprising 376 bedrooms (392 bedspaces) with ancillary reception, lounge, launderette, bin storage and cycle store and provision of 6 car parking spaces</p>		Pending Consideration
<p>2008/1145/01/DET 'Lime Quay', Lime Street, Byker Erection of 2 pigeon lofts and clubhouse including new access steps and gate from Lime Street and slipway area</p>		Pending Consideration

<p>2008/1291/01/ADV</p> <p>'Hotel du Vin', Allan House, City Road.</p> <p>Display of three 1.2M x 2.3M flagpoles to south elevation, three non-illuminated information signs to south elevation, three non-illuminated information signs to south east elevations and one externally illuminated fascia sign to south east elevation and two internally illuminated menu boards inside the coachway entrance</p>	<p>Pending Consideration</p>
<p>2008/1380/01/DET</p> <p>Land To The East Of The Free Trade Inn, Saint Lawrence Road</p> <p>Erection of 4 buildings 4, 5 and 6 storeys in height comprising residential apartments (88 in total) (Class C3), offices (Class B1) and 2 commercial units (Classes A1/A2/A3/B1) and provision of 114 car parking spaces</p>	<p>Pending consideration</p>
<p>2008/0758/01/DET</p> <p>Land To East Of Portland Road</p> <p>Construction of 5 storey building comprising A1 and A2 uses at levels 1 and 2 and B1 offices at levels 2 to 5 and construction of 5 storey building comprising B1 offices. Provision of associated rainwater harvesting plant/tank, servicing and refuse storage at level 1 and roof top plant to each block. Provision of temporary car park (200 spaces) and surface car parking (34 spaces) and associated roads, access and hard and soft landscaping</p>	<p>Granted</p>

<p>2008/0759/01/OUT Land To The East Of Portland Road Outline application: Erection of 8 blocks of residential development comprising 504 units with ancillary A1, A2 and A3 uses in 5 of the blocks at level 1 and provision of multi storey car park (305 spaces), surface car park (97 spaces) and undercroft car parking (320 spaces)</p>	<p>Withdrawn</p>
<p>2007/2084/01/DET Former Anglo-Swedish Engineering Limited, Glasshouse Street, NE6 1BT Erection of 9 town houses (Class C3)</p>	<p>Pending consideration</p>

Planning Appeals

None

OMBAug08DC – Planning Applications Lower Ouseburn

Special Ouseburn Management Board

25 August 2008

(5.45pm – 5.55pm)

Present:

Nick Kemp	(Chair) Newcastle City Councillor (Byker)
Rachel Scott	Ouseburn Arts and Culture Steering Group
Harry James	Ouseburn Business Steering Group
Sheila Spencer	Ouseburn Trust
Stefan Lepkowski	Ouseburn Trust

Also Present:

Peter Kay	Ouseburn Trust
-----------	----------------

In Attendance:

Mick Firth	Citywide Projects Group Manager
David Cross	Byker/Ouseburn Regeneration Team
Dale Bolland	Economic Development Officer
Louise Allwood	Regeneration Centre Administrator
Steve Laws	Democratic Services

16. OUSEBURN MANAGEMENT BOARD - MEMBERSHIP

RESOLVED – That Membership of the Board (Council, Ouseburn Trust and other representation) be on an Annual basis.

17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Psallidas, Sue Bright and Germaine Godwin.

18. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED IN THE LOWER OUSEBURN VALLEY

Submitted: Report of Head of Planning and transportation providing an update of planning applications in the Ouseburn Valley and requiring urgent comment by the Management Board, prior to applications being submitted to Development Control Committee (previously circulated and copy attached to Official Minutes).

An additional report was circulated at the meeting (for copy see Official Minutes).

(1) Former Winn Products Engineers Ltd, 17 Stoddart Street (2008/1275/01/DET)

It was noted that a Development Control Committee site visit was to take place on the following day. Plans, elevation and photo montages were circulated at the

meeting.

During discussion, a number of issues were raised as follows:-

- (1) The Chair felt that the proposal was detrimental and not appropriate, with fundamental design issues. By comparison, across the road, the Biscuit Factory was seen as an 'iconic' building, visitor attraction and 'entrance to the Valley'. Concerns were expressed in relation to traffic and crowding, with special reference being made to the fact that Chinese Church services in this area needed to be taken into account in terms of congestion etc. It was also noted that proposal was 3 storeys higher than the Biscuit Factory at front.
- (2) Concerns were expressed on size, scale, massing and design, parking on either side of street, effects on surrounding area and site use. Sheila Spencer also expressed concern about the 'length' of the development, feeling that there were places for student accommodation in the Valley, but flooding the Valley with provision was not what was required. Stefan Lepkowski was concerned at what looked like a 'square block', at the massing and skyline. If there was a substantial influx of students to the area, what would the other resource requirements be on the area – for example, The Cluny? The Chair felt that this was a question of balance and developing units to meet the current situation.
- (3) It was likely that the figure of 400 was being sought by the developer because this would guarantee 'management' facilities on site. The Chair felt that the management arrangements of the developer should therefore also extend to the management of highways in the surrounding area. If the developer required 394 plus to make the development more viable, then the Board required roof-lines/façade 'breaking-up', with full cognizance given to the buildings surrounding it (such as the Biscuit Factory)
- (4) It was felt that the Biscuit Factory and other buildings had design aspects which the proposal did not take into account.
- (5) Harry James was not so much concerned at massing as with the fact that development needed to 'blend' with the Biscuit Factory and elevation treatments. He (and Sheila Spencer) felt that the building should be set back and the main entrance relocated to a more appropriate place.
- (6) The Board recognised the developer's economic argument for 394/400 places and accepted that the site location was appropriate for student accommodation, but there were concerns about scale, massing and other issues which the Board would wish to have examined as followed: a demonstration of how they'd 'finish' the building in this location, the roofline and façade needed examination, quality of cladding and the way that the development was 'broken up', parking, approach points and vistas, a view on Section 106 was required, the fact that there was no landscaping around the proposal, drop-off points/zones for picking up etc, general access, pedestrian and cycling approaches, entrance in wrong place, more creative use of ground floor space.

Given the question of timescales since an application might be reported to

Committee in September, it was –

RESOLVED – that David Cross send note of the Board's views to the Chair, Sheila Spencer and Peter Kay prior to submission of comments to Development Control, containing views as follows:-

(i) The Ouseburn Management Board does not object to the principle of student accommodation in this location, are pleased to note that the accommodation will have a warden/security staff on the site at all times, and welcomes the redevelopment of an unsightly site as part of the ongoing regeneration of the area;

(ii) However, the Board **objects** to the planning application on the grounds of design and parking provision with the following detailed concerns:

(a) Design

- ☐ The scale and massing of the proposal is too large, and will have a domineering effect on the street scene and adjacent buildings.
- ☐ The elevations are bland and give the proposal a monolithic appearance. More careful consideration should be given to the treatment of these elevations to break up their visual impact.
- ☐ The proposed materials on the elevations are of very poor quality, and do not reflect the materials and design details on nearby buildings (e.g. the Biscuit Factory and Stephenson House).
- ☐ This area is one of the key entrances into the Ouseburn Regeneration Area and includes a key visitor attraction to the area i.e. The Biscuit Factory. The proposed building is of a very poor design and does not reflect the importance of this location.
- ☐ The Board is aware that amended details of the design are being submitted, and would wish to be consulted on these before a decision is made on the planning application.

(b) Highways and Parking

- ☐ The provision of 10 parking spaces is inadequate for a development of this size, particularly on this busy road and directly adjacent to a busy roundabout. There is a history of parking problems around Stephenson House and this proposal will exacerbate this.
- ☐ More thought should be given to the provision of a drop-off area for taxis etc. during term time. The location of the pedestrian entrance onto the roundabout will encourage taxis etc. to park there when picking up/dropping off customers. This may have implications for traffic flow and safety.
- _ More information should be provided into the management of parking in the wider area, including the use of developer contributions for the provision of a car park.
- _ The Board wishes to be informed of the extent of any contribution required under OPAS (and any other S.106 contributions)."

(2) Land to East of Free Trade Inn: Saint Lawrence Road – Erection of 4 buildings (2008/1380/01/DET)

Plans were displayed at the meeting. The Board liked the scheme and the fact that there was recognition of the Valley but there were concerns at further development of 1 and 2 bedroom flats that remained empty. There was a need for a mixed, sustainable community. Concerns were also expressed over the straight unbroken roofline.

RESOLVED – That David Cross send a note to the Chair, Sheila Spencer and Peter Kay prior to submission of comments to Development Control Committee.

19. **CLOSURE OF STEPNEY ROAD**

Sheila Spencer advised that Ray Bland had received a consultation letter on the above – when it had been understood that this would not happen. Dale Bolland advised that Jonathan Higgins had made an approach to Highways following Board discussion, but Highways had already started the process. The Chair urged for clarity here.

RESOLVED – that this matter be discussed at the next Board meeting.