

John Morris

Subject: FW: P/20/0530/FUL

From: Crawford Sibbald
Sent: 23 June 2021 16:42
To: David Paterson
Subject: RE: P/20/0530/FUL

Hi David

I am unsure if the statement they have provided on the windows is sufficient. I would assume that double glazing would be in place as standard. I think my initial comment was that they investigate further as to whether the centre would have any impact on the proposed properties, however, as I noted at the time, due to Covid restrictions it is unlikely that the centre will be getting used to its full potential.

Possibly, higher specified glazing may offer more protection.

My general thoughts are that it is not ideal to have residential dwellings right next to a community centre, however, if you accept their proposal or ask for higher grade glazing then I will not be objecting.

Happy to discuss further if you want.

Thanks

Crawford

From: David Paterson
Sent: 23 June 2021 08:51
To: Crawford Sibbald
Subject: FW: P/20/0530/FUL

Good morning Crawford

Hope all well today.

I would welcome your comments re the windows. Would noise reduction windows be sufficient. My feeling is that there would be sufficient distance hopefully for that to be OK.

Have a good day Crawford.

Dave P

David Paterson
Planning Officer
Development Management
Falkirk Council
Development Services
Tel 01324 504757

From: claire.perperidis
Sent: 23 June 2021 08:45

To: David Paterson
Subject: RE: P/20/0530/FUL

Hello David,

Thanks for the call yesterday and email below, please see my comments in red.

Kind Regards
Claire

From: David Paterson
Sent: 22 June 2021 16:29
To: claire.perperidis
Subject: P/20/0530/FUL

Hello Claire

Following out discussion earlier I can advise that:-

- . The application is likely to go forwards to recommendation on Friday with recommendation to refuse solely on grounds of insufficient parking provision.
- . It is likely that I could support the proposal if the second floor of block A was omitted and 2 more parking spaces provided. I note we discussed where these spaces could be located.
- . Can you provide a statement demonstrating the means by which the development takes account of potential noise from the adjacent community centre.
We propose double glazed windows which should be more than sufficient to mask the amount of noise we would expect from a community centre. If anything further is required we will specify noise reducing windows to the ones closest to the centre in the elevation of Block B facing towards the centre.
- . If the development had gone forward for recommendation to refuse then the provision of parking outwith the site boundary would have to have been addressed by means of a Section 75 Obligation.
Our client has agreed to a section 75 obligation.
- . Not confirmed earlier Claire, sorry, but the developer contribution towards open space provision has changed since the adoption of the new SG05 "Green Infrastructure". The previous contribution totalled £21,976.50 (£10,143 towards active open space and £11,833.50 towards passive open space) The new guidance calculates as :-

Active open space

$$22 \times £300 + 1 \times £600 = £7290.$$

Passive open space

$$22 \times £400 + 1 \times £800 = £9600$$

Natural Greenspace contribution

$$22 \times £125 + 1 \times £250 = £3000$$

$$\text{Total} = £19,800$$

I will advise in due course the relevant roads guidance we discussed.

I hope this clarifies.

David Paterson
Planning Officer
Development Management
Falkirk Council
Development Services

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and is intended only for the named recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action or reliance on it. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender. Any unauthorised disclosure of the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

The views and opinions expressed in this e-mail are the senders own and do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of Falkirk Council.
