

ADDENDUM 9 July 2019

Item No: 5.3

| | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------|---------------|
| Application No: | 19/00436/FUL | Author | Jane Tuck |
| Date valid: | 29 March 2019 | : | |
| Target decision date: | 28 June 2019 | ☎: | 0191 643 6331 |
| | | Ward: | Riverside |

Application type: full planning application

Location: 26 - 37 Clive Street North Shields Tyne And Wear NE29 6LD

Proposal: Demolition of the former North Eastern Rubber Company factory buildings and construction of three residential apartment blocks, comprising of 49no one bedroomed and two bedroomed apartments and 1no two bedroom townhouse and associated parking

Applicant: J C Quay Limited, Mr G Green The Bailey Cumberland Road North Shields NE29 8RD

Agent: Ian Stewart, Lynwood Sealane Seaburn Sunderland SR6 8EE

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

Members are requested to authorise that the Head of Law and Governance and the Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure to undertake all necessary procedures (Section 278 Agreement) to secure:

**Upgrade of footpaths abutting site
Associated street lighting
Associated drainage
Associated road markings
Associated Traffic Regulation Orders
Associated street furniture & signage**

The applicant will be required to stop up the highway within the site that is no longer required under Section 247/257 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

INFORMATION

The applicant has submitted a unilateral undertaking to secure a contribution of £10,000 for a Coastal Mitigation Service to mitigate for the impacts on the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area.

An objection letter has been received from the Northumberland and Newcastle Society.

The Society submitted objections to the earlier application for this site, (18/00300/FUL) and a statement of objection to the consequent appeal against refusal. It is understood that amendments to that application submitted after the appeal was launched were deemed could not be considered as part of it. As this new application is so similar to the original and merely adjusts a few details we presume the council will not be determining it until the results of the appeal are known.

In the Society's view, the detailed reasons given for refusing the earlier application were entirely correct and the scheme was contrary to local Plan Policy DM6.1. A number of small cosmetic changes can be seen in the new application and are set out by the agents in points (a) to (g) of their letter to FISH dated 18.3.19. These do not disguise the fact that the scheme is virtually the same as that which was for good reasons refused.

The Society believes that these are inducements presented to Planning Officers to consider the scheme more favourably and that these are attempts to relate them to the history of the area but are themselves questionable.

The outdoor corten mesh screens added to the front of Block B and the gables of Block C appear to be attempts to supply some of the visual interest lacking in the general bulk of the buildings but their size and prominence do not relate well to the character of the conservation area. Those especially on Block C will appear as intrusions in the street scene, much as advertising billboards would.

The addition of a shallow pitched roof of unstated pitch will not greatly affect or improve the views from Yeoman Street or register visually from street level. The widening of the gap adjacent to the Porthole building seems to emphasise that the Block C was designed to be freestanding and so does not contribute positively to a continuous streetscape on Clive Street. The wider gap also further isolates the Porthole from its neighbours and setting. The wider "slot view" created will not reveal more of the river as it is still blocked by the town house (see perspective 09).

The views expressed by the residents of Yeoman Street in their letters published online on 25 April and 3 May are well-argued and the Society strongly supports these.

The Society does not consider that this revised application changes its previously stated view that the scheme is not the right one for this important site and comes no nearer to meeting the requirements of Policy DM6.1 than the original submission 18/00300/FUL did.

Therefore, the Society would submit that this application should also be refused.

Officer Comments

The issues raised in the objection from the Northumberland and Newcastle Society have been addressed in the officer's report. The recommendation and conditions proposed remain unchanged.