

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Mick Dawson - at HV](mailto:Mick.Dawson@southtyneside.gov.uk)

**To:** [planningapplications@southtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:planningapplications@southtyneside.gov.uk)

**Sent:** Monday, July 14, 2014 7:13 AM

**Subject:** Planning Application: ST/0461/14/FUL

Six points to take into account when considering Planning Application ST/0461/14/FUL.

From: Michael Dawson of: Amble, Northumberland.

Liable for rates etc. for former residence: Greens Place, South Shields

1. The River Drive development and its further planned development (Office block and additional slipway and shed) goes against the Local Development Framework. To quote "Capitalising on South Tyneside's environmental assets is about taking measures to: • **Protect and enhance the strategic Green Belt, coastal and wildlife corridors**; • Ensure that development throughout the Borough reflects the character and distinctiveness of its surroundings; • Boost the town centres of South Shields and Jarrow by linking them to adjacent World Heritage Sites; • **Revive major riverside sites by reducing noise, pollution and risk**; and • Add value to existing and create new environmental assets, especially in the Great North Forest.<sup>2</sup>
2. **Noise** - Since the first slipway shed was erected (although considered incomplete without doors) noise emission has substantially increased for local residents. Some of this noise may have been the result of construction but machinery noise such as compressors etc will increase with further development. Machinery noise was never noticeable from my residence, 70 Greens Place (120m west) until this year. Allegedly the applicants record in is unfavourable in other yards owned by UK Docks. STC no doubt have records of this fact.
3. **Airborne pollutants** -Complaints from neighbouring properties about particulate emission should by now be well documented by STC's Environment Department regarding the current development. UK Docks application to further develop the site and increase its capacity will inevitably increase the risk of particulate emission; particularly if there is no plan to enclose the sheds. This presents as a potential health hazard to the resident population.
4. The current slipway shed is considered by residents to have been built 3m higher than plans provided show. However there is considerable ongoing argument with the Planning Department about which plans are those originally approved by Tyne and Wear Development Corporation. It seems incomprehensible that further work should be considered until such time as issues surrounding the current construction have been resolved.
5. Visual Amenity – The current Slipway construction on River Drive has resulted in a loss of Visual Amenity. Further development will obviously compound the loss. Visual Amenity can be defined as 'a measure of the visual quality of a site or area experienced by residents, workers or visitors. It is the collective impact of the visual components which make a site or an area pleasant to be in. It is a consideration of elements which contribute to the visual pleasantness and character of towns, localities and neighbourhoods'.I consider that visual amenity of this area is reduced even further by the addition of the future development of this site.
6. My understanding is that in 1996 as part of their approval for the current development, Tyne and Wear Development Corporation wrote to the proprietor of UK Docks stating that they would not support further expansion of this site so close to a residential estate. Reference: DVD held by STC.

MD