

PLANNING COMMITTEE - AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Committee Date: 14th September 2021

Officers Present: Roy Sykes – Head of Planning, Stacy Cutler – Senior Legal Officer, Amber Torrington – Governance Officer, Garry Hildersley – Development Manager, Nicola Elliot – Principal Planning Officer, and Alicia Murray – Principal Planning Officer

Agenda Item No. and Application Reference	Notes
<p>ITEM 1</p> <p>19/00100/OUTM</p>	<p>Application description</p> <p>Location: Land On The North Side Of Alexandra Street, Thorne, Doncaster</p> <p><u>Request to Speak</u></p> <p>None – However the Knox Trust (the applicant) have requested that a statement is read out on their behalf to the planning committee.</p>
<p>ITEM 2</p> <p>20/03191/FULM</p>	<p>Application description - Conversion of former Public House into 9 residential apartments and a community space within part of the ground floor, with external alterations and associated works.</p> <p>Location – Former Eagle and Child Public House, 2 West Street, Conisbrough, DN12 3JH</p> <p><u>Request to Speak</u></p> <p>Mr Paul Hastings (applicant) – in support.</p> <p><u>Amended conditions</u></p> <p>Condition 5 – should include for both residential and commercial/community use, so would read as follows:</p> <p>No development shall take place before details of the provisions for the storage and recycling of refuse for both the residential use and commercial/community use have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such provisions shall be made/constructed prior to the first occupation of the building and shall thereafter be made permanently available for the occupants of the building.</p> <p>REASON</p> <p>To ensure the satisfactory provision of facilities for the storage of refuse.</p>

Additional Representations:

Mr Paddy Cawkwell has provided a third representation on this application post committee agenda, the representation outlines the following:

"I am pleased a café has been proposed to try and mitigate the loss of any of the social interaction the former public house may have given.

The café needs to be financially viable so I hope both the Council and the folks collecting the rent will bear this in mind.

My concerns about the exterior remain, there is one building in this application and we have three different types of finishes - smooth, rough and what I will call paint brush.

I am staggered that this could be considered as ever being acceptable.

My concern about refuse storage/collection remain.

My concern about residents emerging from the building on to West Street remain.

I want to support the application but DMBC and the developer need to engage with neighbours in order to make this happen."

Clr Pearson has submitted an additional representation to be presented to Planning Committee Members, outlined in full below:

"Dear Chair and Members

We write to object to planning application 20/03191/FULM formerly known as the Eagle & Child public house. Although numerous comments have been made by the 3 ward members no planning officer has responded to these comments or discussed them in any way shape or form, and although they have known for some time we wished to challenge the application myself and Lani Ball have never been made aware when this matter was going to planning committee by a member of planning. Nigel Ball got to know this by pure fluke a few days ago.

As all 3 Ward members have very busy diaries and give commitments months in advance it is not possible for us to attend in person.

We would like to ask if this item could be postponed to a date that is mutually satisfactory. If this is not possible, we would like to raise the following points of objection:

- 1. the building is in an area of the village where no one has a garage to park a car*
- 2. It is at the junction of a one way system that was put in place to alleviate significant parking and passing problems when the public house was in use.*
- 3. There is a major problem with vehicles speeding up and down New Hill that potentially could lead to an accident taking place with bad parking.*
- 4. The application seeks 9 units this means I believe as agreed by Council, that there should be 2 parking spaces per unit. This is obviously not the case. Therefore this will mean an area that is renowned for parking problems and damage to cars will be made much worse and could lead to congestion on a road that is one of the main arteries into the village. This is also non traffic light regulated. We also understand that the planning now seeks 9 units and a commercial/community space on the ground floor with the suggestion that this is let out as a cafe/community gathering space. Our concerns again relate to the parking and overcrowding aspects of this new community space. Although need may not be an issue the introduction of yet another cafe seems a project set to fail and concern that a change of use will be sought in some form of attempt to let the space is also deeply concerning for without the sale of alcohol there are already more than enough cafes to meet the needs of local residents and visitors.*
- 5. Many residents have asked for on street parking bays to be created and properties to require garages /parking spaces to alleviate on street parking.*
- 6. This will also impact the limited parking bays that exist for shoppers visiting the shopping centre of the village possibly causing even more congestion and loss of business to the traders, especially those on West Street.*
- 7. We would also suggest that the present design even with the number of flats being limited to 9 instead of the 11 flats that was initially proposed, would still not have enough cubic space for a tenant to experience good mental and physical wellbeing as they would not be able to share the communal area if they were in isolation.*
- 8. The village has unfortunately seen a proliferation of HMO's in recent times both managed and unmanaged leading to numerous complaints from our Constituents about noise, drinking, ASB, drug taking, parking problems, unreasonable behaviour towards other residents and neighbours. Our Constituents and ourselves are extremely concerned by this rise in HMO's being opened and the effects that these have on the community.*

	<p>9. Obviously there is no green space provision or landscaping to protect local residents from the noise generated by the new units and will impact on the building next door in many ways both day and night time.</p> <p>We would therefore ask the committee to make a determination that the proposed plan for the old Eagle & Child public house in its present format is not suitable and that a smaller development should be encouraged and a reconsideration of the community space/cafe should be looked at for other use.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Councillors Ian Pearson, Nigel Ball, Lani-mae Ball”</p>
<p>ITEM 3 20/03301/FUL</p>	<p>Application description - Erection of a two storey office building (9.6m x 9.6m) for a temporary period (to be removed by January 2034).</p> <p>Location - Hazel Lane Quarry, Wakefield Road, Hampole, Doncaster</p> <p><u>Requests to Speak</u></p> <p>Dr Nick Balliger has made a request to speak in opposition to the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Chris Ballam (agent) has made a request to speak in support of the proposal.</p> <p><u>Amendment to Report and Recommendation</u></p> <p>Following Legal advice, there is no need for the development to be granted subject to a Section 106 Agreement to require demolition of the office following the temporary period. Condition no. 2 covers this adequately and paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that ‘planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition’. As such, the condition is enforceable and a separate Section 106 Agreement is not required.</p> <p><u>Consultations Responses</u></p> <p>The comments of Hampole and Skelbrooke Parish Meeting have not been included in the Planning Committee in error and are therefore summarised below;</p>

Raise objection to the proposal for the following reasons;

- will be significantly more visible than the existing single storey temporary ones from the surrounding area and will have a greater negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt
- does not need to be two storeys – large amount of open space available on site
- the building is not temporary in nature
- removal of woodland is unnecessary and destroys screening, making the site more visible from Hazel Lane
- residents strongly believe that Catplant should not be allowed permission to develop further until they follow the conditions of existing planning permissions, enforcements from refused applications and until they have honoured existing section 106 agreements (for example height of the tip, mud on road, Sterefibre stored on site, litter from lorries)