

PLANNING COMMITTEE - AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Committee Date: 18th August 2020

Officers Present: Roy Sykes – Head of Planning, Garry Hildersley – Planning Development Manager, Andrea Suddes – Principal Planning Officer, Mark Ramsay – Senior Planning Officer, Daniel Atkinson- Trees & Hedgerows Officer, Adam Bottomley – Senior Legal Officer, David Taylor- Senior Governance Officer, Amber Torrington – Governance Officer

Agenda Item No. 5 and Application Reference	Notes
ITEM 1 19/00099/OUTM	<p>Application description:</p> <p>Location: Land To The South Of Alexandra Street, Thorne, Doncaster, DN8 4EY</p> <p><u>Requests to Speak</u></p> <p>Councillor Joe Blackham would like to speak in support of the application.</p> <p>Councillor Mark Houlbrook would like to speak in support of the application.</p> <p>Diane Holgate (Agent) of DCH Planning Consultants and Mark Staniland/Lee Webster of Mott McDonald have requested to jointly speak in favour of the application sharing the allotted time.</p>
ITEM 2 19/00100/OUTM	<p>Application description:</p> <p>Location: Land To The North Of Alexandra Street, Thorne, Doncaster, DN8 4EY</p> <p><u>Requests to Speak</u></p> <p>Councillor Joe Blackham would like to speak in support of the application.</p> <p>Diane Holgate (Agent) of DCH Planning Consultants and Mark Staniland/Lee Webster of Mott McDonald have requested to jointly speak in favour of the application sharing the allotted time.</p>
ITEM 4 19/02916/FUL	<p>Application description: Change of use of Offices to Care Home with Nursing Support.</p>

	<p>Location: Auckland House 109 Thorne Road</p> <p><u>Requests to Speak</u></p> <p>Presentation of a 2 minute video</p> <p>Tony Gearty CEO at Cheswold Park will then be available for questions from members.</p>
<p>AGENDA ITEM 6</p>	<p>Doncaster Council Tree Preservation Order (No.411).</p> <p>Location: Chateau Renee and Woodside, Sutton Road, Campsall, Doncaster</p> <p><u>Requests to Speak</u></p> <p>Councillor John Gilliver has requested to speak in support of the application.</p> <p><u>Report correction</u></p> <p>One of the trees recommended for omission from the order was misidentified within the committee report as T5 which is an Atlas Cedar. The Atlas Cedar that has had a major failure and as a result it is no longer in a structural condition that no longer merits long term protection with the Order is T8. T5 still merits inclusion within the order and long term protection.</p> <p>As a result the corrected recommendation is to confirm the order with the omission of one Atlas Cedar (T8) and one Japanese Cedar (T3).</p> <p><u>Additional representations</u></p> <p>Three representations have been received from local residents that were not duly made due to being outside the initial consultation period for the provisional Tree Preservation Order. The representations are supporting the confirmation of the order but without the omission of T8 (Atlas Cedar) and T3 (Japanese Cedar) from it.</p> <p>To summarize the reasons for not supporting the omission of T8 and T3 from the order are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exclusion of a couple of trees is not because they are dangerous or diseased but simply because they are in the way of the proposed development. <p>Tree officer comments – T8 had a major failure of one of its main leaders in early 2020 shortly after the provisional order was served. As a result it is no longer in a structural condition that merits long term protection with the Order. This tree was also shown on the development plans as being retained. T3 was also shown to</p>

be retained on the development plans and isn't going to be impacted by the foot print of the proposed buildings or other structures as part of the 18/02033/OUT development.

- The reason for the order was to protect the trees due to any construction taking place on the Chateau Renne site. So the omission of the two trees is so construction work could take place freely without any care for these trees or others.

Tree officer comments – Both these trees were shown for retention on the development plans at the site. It is true the intention of the Order was to help reinforce any future planning conditions that would be placed on future full or reserved matters applications, but there is still the desire to protect existing trees providing they merit protection and retention within a development. As a result T3 will still be given due consideration regardless of its inclusion within the Order and T8 due to its failure no longer merits protection and has limited long term prospects.

- The diversity/tree survey report clearly states that all trees are important in that setting and must not be removed.

Tree officer comments – It is agreed that the species and age diversity at the site is good and that trees provide very valuable environmental services. As a result the council will continue to try and work constructively with the site and others in the local area to protect and preserve the trees regardless of the protection status. This will be through encouraging new planting where appropriate, sustainable management and management the follows industry best practice.