

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

NOVEMBER 2005

This statement of community involvement is considered to be in accordance with Newcastle City Councils Draft Statement of Community Involvement (14 June 2005).

This statement sets out how the community has been involved in the development and production of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Design Framework for the Lower Ouseburn Valley, in order to ensure a transparent and open planning process.

Throughout the production stages of the SPD there has been a thorough consultation process undertaken by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that public participation requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulation 2004 have been met.

The steps taken to ensure effective community involvement are explained below, they cover the headings of:

1. Scoping of the exercise
2. Consultation with the Councils Planning Authority
3. Mapping of community groups and other stakeholders
4. Building capacity and creating partnerships
5. Undertaking consultation and encouraging participation
6. Ensuring everybody has an opportunity to be involved
7. Feedback
8. Evaluation and external assessment

Pre-production

The development of the Design Framework arose from a number of pressures raised internally and externally (at the Ouseburn Advisory Committee, amongst developers and members of the general public).

The ideas for the document were developed internally from May 2004, with early consultation with English Heritage.

Initial ideas (draft version of the document) were consulted upon through the Implementation Group of the Ouseburn Advisory Committee (OAC) and the OAC, June 2004. The draft document was approved for formal consultation at Development Control Committee in July 2004. This consultation included a letter drop within the framework area and to statutory consultees and a drop-in event (1 September 2004 at a local venue), copies of the document

were available at various locations and on request. A presentation of the document was also given to the Conservation Advisory Committee (July 2004).

The draft was formally approved at Development Control Committee in September 2004.

The first version of the Framework

The OAC (consisting of local members, representatives from the Ouseburn Trust and other local forums and groups in the Valley) was consulted upon the first draft of the Design Framework, when it was first approved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Committee welcomed the document and suggests improvements which were incorporated. Other consultees that made response to the first copy of the Design Framework included:

- North East Civic Trust welcomed the guidance and the inclusion of a design statement.
- Conservation Advisory Committee welcomed the document and recommended the inclusion of sustainability issues in new design – this comment has been included in the revision of the document.
- English Heritage, who were involved in the early design meeting leading to the production of the document welcomed its production but raised a number of concerns over better illustrations to support the analysis, these have been incorporated in the revision.
- Newcastle and Northumberland Society supported concept of the document and the attention being made to this area.

Responses made through the public consultation exercise were all positive, welcoming the clear detailed guidance that would improve the standards of development in the Valley. Additionally the current landowners within the area welcomed the guidance as a positive step forward for future development/redevelopment.

Production of the Revised Framework, and initial consultation

The need for the expansion of this original document increased from September 2004 with additional sub-area guidance developed.

- 1) Revision of introductory chapters – arose from comments from previous consultation and revisions of planning guidance. Initial consultation included internal consultation and the Implementation Group of the OAC where it was received and comments noted.
- 2) Maling Street sub-area – arose from developer interest, initial consultation included internal, discussion at the Implementation Group of the OAC (19 October) where it was received and comments noted, and discussion with interest developers and their appointed architects, in order to progress the redevelopment of the site. Queries raised over Maling Street included the City Road Garage site and the removal of the hoardings currently on the site - the guidance covers the City Road Garage site, any new development will involve the permanent removal of the hoardings.

- 3) Lower Steenberg's sub-area – arose from the need to market/develop the site. Initial consultation included internal and discussion at the Implementation Group of the OAC (17 March) where it was received and comments raised that included a discussion on car parking issues - where parking could be provided and how access would be gained into the site; the need for clear pedestrian routes, the issue of demand for commercial space was aired with the conclusion that further information would be collated on upon the wider economic demand in the Valley.

The draft revision was also presented to the Conservation Area Advisory Committee in January where it was well received.

The issues raised from the initial consultation period were considered in the development of the draft SPD.

Draft SPD

The draft was taken to SPD Committee in July 2005 where it was issued for consultation purposes. An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper. Copies of the draft SPD were available on the internet, at the Customer Service Centre at the Civic Centre, at the Ouseburn Regeneration Centre, Ouseburn Resource Centre, at the community office at Wretham Place, Sheildfield and a summary document from officers at request. The draft Statement of Community Involvement and the draft Sustainability Appraisal were also available to view at the same locations.

The public consultation ran for a period of 9 weeks (from 1 August – 30 September 2005) and included:

- Letter drop to adjacent land owners/occupiers,
- Awareness given to local interest groups and organisations (those that feed into the OAC)
- Letters to statutory consultees (as listed below),
- Presentation at the Ouseburn Advisory Committee
- A number of drop-in sessions – 15 August at the Ouseburn Resource Centre and the 18 August at the Regeneration Centre, where officers were available between the hours of 2.00pm to 6.00pm to give the community chance ask queries and comment.
- The Ouseburn Trust, a community body within the Valley also held a special meeting to discuss the Framework with their members and to formulate a joint response

Statutory consultees:

- Government Office for the North East
- The Countryside Agency
- The Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission
- English Nature

Ouseburn Urban Design Framework;

- The Strategic Rail Authority (Network Rail)
- Northumbria Water
- English Heritage
- Local Ward Members of Byker and Ouseburn

Consultation Responses

A number of representations were received regarding the draft SPD. These have been summarised, along with the Councils response and recommendation, and can be viewed below.

Summary of Representations and Recommendations following consultation period

Name & Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
Resident – non local	Support in principle – don't want to lose special quality of the area	Welcomes the support	None
English Nature	Would welcome the promotion of 'wildlife friendly' features in new or redeveloped buildings	The idea of 'green roofs' are encouraged, they are highlighted within the design framework, specifically within the Maling St sub-area (p.60)	None
Resident – non local	Welcomes the document – exciting and imaginative, request to retain fig tree	Welcomes the support, retention of the fig tree is included in the Maling St sub-area (p.65)	None
Local Business (7 stories)	Welcomes the document, supports the vision and navigability of the valley, would welcome the inclusion of improved public transport and emphasis upon sustainability criteria	Welcomes the support, inclusion of sustainability is evident through out the document	Addition to para.2.3 on sustainability
Nexus	Supports the document, but would like to see inclusion of public transport	Welcomes the support, emphasis upon sustainability is evident through out the report	Addition to para.2.3 on sustainability
Local Business	Supports the document	Welcomes the support	None
Conservation Advisory Committee	Supports the document, and made comments regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern over ref to Borneo, believes that land ownership is key to defining active frontage - queries over expansion of framework to other areas - chimneys fundamental to character of area - welcomed use of green roofs 	Welcomes the support	None

continued

Name & Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
Ouseburn Advisory Committee	<p>General support of proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - routes through wide enough? - modernity, contemporary design - no 'identikit' buildings - small scale development better than large scale – diversity - limited prescription necessary - query over height of Ouse St - Ouse St closure? 	<p>Welcomes the support,</p> <p>the routes proposed are wider than those identified as part of the Ice factory development. The framework attempts to increase diversity in building style and encourage smaller buildings to avoid 'identikit' and large monolithic blocks. Ouse St closure is something that would require stopping up and further analysis at a later stage</p>	None
Ouseburn Trust	<p>Excellent and Commendable documents in regard to depth of analysis, and in placing Ouseburn in a historic, visual and topographical context.</p> <p>More specifically -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Links beyond valley 2 Understanding of serial visioning – viewing direction do not convey 'sense of place' 3 Key view cones incomplete, additions suggested, supported by photographs 4 Collage City and Abstract Analysis confusing 5 SWOT needs to include Cut Bank/ Byker Bank 6 No timescale for development mentioned 7 What is scope of document and does it supersede other work done? 8. Inclusion of accessibility – public transport and cycling facilities, local facilities 9 Principles of sustainability increased 10 Consultation – wider dissemination of the information – physical models would assist 	<p>Welcomes the support, and has the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Legible links are associated with the Conservation Area Management Plan, to which this document forms an appendix, the framework is specific to the area the conservation area covers. 2 The serial visioning captures the views referred to in the Management Plan and Character Statement 3 View cones? 4 Collage City and Abstract analysis are just two of the many analysis techniques used to define the strategic design principles, it is these principles that will have to be adhered to, the analysis simply supports the argument. 5 The issue of traffic on Cut Bank/Byker Bank is addressed through the 'traffic/transportation problems' 	Addition to para.2.3 on sustainability

Name & Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
English Heritage	<p>Welcomes the document</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Crucial design principles are lost amongst other information 2 Document assumes certain level of knowledge, repetition of OS may be useful 3 Analysis is extensive but doesn't outline actual analysis and confusing in places 4 Topographical diagrams unclear 5 New development (p.55) stress need for 'buildings in context 6 Design Statement to include contextual appraisal 7 Height of new development has not been presented in full sections across the valley 8 More information needed on the Ince Building 9 OS Map to illustrate sub-areas 10 Should Maynards be retained? 11 Height of proposed buildings in relation to chimney in Lower Steenbergs 12 Sketches are orientated north of bottom, could this be reversed 	<p>Welcomes the support,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The format of the document needs to be changed so the design principles form the bulk of the document 2 OS plans of the sites will add extra information 3 Analysis work undertaken acted as a basis to set out the generic design principles, which were then developed into site-specific principles 4 The technology used gave broad scale however this was considered adequate to illustrate that the Ouseburn needs to be developed at a finer grain 5 Buildings in context is mentioned in the Conservation Area Management Plan (to which this document is appended to, it is also now to be incorporated into the generic design principles 6 Contextual appraisal is to be added 7 New sections have been drawn and datasets used (DEM, DTM) give more accurate heights than OS data used 8 Photographs have been included of the Ince Building that enhance the prescriptive guidance given 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The generic and specific design principles now form the key part of the document 2 OS plans have been included as an introduction to each sub-area 5 Addition of a generic design principle relating to context 6 see 5. 7 New cross sections added in Maling St sub-area 8 Indicative images have been added under Maling St sub-area 9 see 2 <p style="text-align: right;"><i>continued</i></p>

Name & Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
English Heritage		<p>9 OS Maps are now included as part of the introduction to each sub-area</p> <p>10 Maynards Toffee Factory is to be retained in accordance with the Management Plan</p> <p>11 The scale and massing given to adjacent development is considered to be befitting to the character of the area</p> <p>12 Due to timescales to approve the document the series of sketches cannot be reversed</p>	
CBRE	<p>Support the guidance however important it can be translated into a viable development – comments specific to Maling St</p> <p>1 Diagram 1 confusing over the boundaries of the framework</p> <p>2 Request amendments to IPG that Maling St within pathfinder area</p> <p>3 Crit.2 para.3.1-inc 'however is some instances this will not be achievable due to existing physical constraints and the need to achieve other design objectives...flexible approach should be adopted seeking the most appropriate design</p> <p>4 Set out land uses acceptable – A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, C2, C3, B1, D1, D2</p> <p>5 Deletion of 'retention of wall running along Back Maling St' as it is likely to be unfeasible, question the widening of the stairs connecting Maling St to Back Maling St</p> <p>6 Double fronted properties are impossible due to level differences and DDA requirements, ref should be deleted.</p>	<p>Welcome the support</p> <p>1 The diagrams that illustrate the boundaries for the framework (pg.4,6,7) are considered to adequately illustrate the framework boundaries</p> <p>2 The IPG referred to in para. 2.2 highlights the site within the pathfinder area</p> <p>3 If the proposed development cannot meet the principles set out they will need clear justification why they are not achievable, using site investigation reports etc.</p> <p>4 This term is taken from the Regeneration Strategy, for further information this document should be examined.</p>	<p>2 Alteration of para.2.2 IPG in light of revised planning guidance</p> <p>6 Active frontage definition included in glossary, appendix.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>continued</i></p>

Name & Organisation	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
CBRE	<p>7 Ref to specific heights of units should be deleted considered too prescriptive</p> <p>8. Crit 10 – scale and massing should be re-drafted to deal with each individual development block and vary accordingly</p> <p>9 Crit 12 green extension to be deleted – green toe could be at the expense of definition of Ford St</p> <p>10 Concern that illustrations included in the document set a precedent for member – would like consultation</p>	<p>5 References to retention of the retaining walls are to be retained, a full structural support will need to be submitted with any development proposal to illustrate the reasons why this can't be achieved</p> <p>6 Definition of active frontages is included in glossary</p> <p>7 Specific heights set out in crit.7 considered to control storey height, that can vary greatly, if it is considered this criteria cannot be achieved then will need to be justified with supporting information</p> <p>8 The Management Plan states that the Ince Building should be the tallest building, the framework, as an appendix this framework supports this</p> <p>9 Crit. 12 states tha there is 'potential' giving flexibility</p> <p>10 The illustrations are indicative only, clear reference is made through-out the document</p>	