

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
4th January 2017

Agenda item 4

Application ref. 16/00630/FUL

2-4 Marsh Parade, Newcastle

Since the preparation of the main agenda report the **Environmental Health Division (EHD)** has provided further advice on acoustic information that had been submitted.

The amended acoustic assessment sets out that side windows will be removed (and replaced with brickwork) to reduce noise 'break in'. The EHD have indicated that this would address that concern but they still have concerns about the specification of the glazing and use of doors on the front elevation of the building on the ground, first and second floors. Therefore EHD still object to the application on the grounds that the applicant has still failed to satisfy their concerns about the impact of neighbouring noise sources on the residential amenity levels of future occupiers of the proposed flats.

The **applicant** has requested that a decision on this application be deferred to the next meeting. They say that this would allow further additional information to be submitted to address concerns about the impact and potential loss of trees and to provide updated information requested regarding acoustic details.

Your Officer's comments

Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant's acoustic consultant has indicated that no windows will be proposed in the side elevations (gables) of the four storey building to address noise concerns no amended plans have been submitted showing this. The plans submitted for consideration, and determination, show a number of windows in all four storeys within each of the two gables which add interest and variety to the gables. For the avoidance of doubt your officers would not encourage four storey blank gables, particularly on the elevation that faces north because this gable would have prominent views from key vantage points, namely from Hassell Street and George Street, which would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Your Officer consider that a condition could be imposed requiring all windows (and where appropriate doors) to meet a certain level of glazing specification and ventilation. EHD have advised that they will outline what this would be prior to the meeting and this information will be provided in a further supplementary.

With respect to the tree issue, the applicant has suggested that they could make further amendments to the scheme that they consider may mean that the Landscape Development Section may feel able to withdraw their objection. No such amendments have been received has been received from the applicant although they have written to the LDS and are awaiting a response. The applicant's request for a deferral would allow for further information to be submitted and considered by the LDS. These amendments have not yet been set out in a plan but they are likely to result in the three car parking spaces at the front of the site being removed, along with a dwarf wall. This would leave the development with a maximum of 7 off street car parking spaces (10 rather than the reported 11 spaces being currently shown on the site plan). Your Officer's view is that given the length of time that the application has been with the authority, that the views of the LDS on the scheme have been known for a long time during which the applicant has had sufficient opportunity to address them, and that the views of others (such as the Highway Authority and third parties upon such a change) have not been sought (and should be were such a proposal to be considered), the application should now be determined on the basis of what is currently before the Authority.

If the applicant does not wish the current scheme to be considered, they can withdraw it.

The RECOMMENDATION remains as per the main agenda report