
REPORTS FOR CIRCULATION

REPORT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – CITY DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report is circulated to the Committee. It includes additional information received after the preparation of the committee report. This information may allow a revised recommendation to be made.

LIST OF CIRCULATED ITEMS

- Item 2 – Rowlandson House (ref: 21/02435/FUL)

Following the preparation of the main report the following submission has been received from Ward Councillor, Councillor Michael Mordey.

Statement from Councillor Michael Mordey with respect of Planning

Application 21/02435/FUL Full Application.

Proposal: Change of use of existing residential care home (Use Class C2) to non-residential institution as a children's day nursery. Location: Rowlandson House, 1 And 2 Rowlandson Terrace, Sunderland, SR2 7SU.

Unfortunately, I am unable to be present at the committee hearing this evening as you consider the above application but wished the committee to be aware of my position as the local councillor for the area.

First, I would like to correct an error in the committee report, as you will note it says that I was a consultee on the report. I understand this will be clarified by officers in the late sheet but wanted to make clear that I was not a member of the council, when the email notification was issued to ward councillors in October 2021. Therefore, the first time I was aware that the planning application was to come before committee was when I was sent a copy of the agenda.

As colleagues will note from the committee report, this application has been before members on two separate occasions, each time members have chosen to refuse planning consent – against the recommendation of officers. Following the refusals, the applicant appealed on both occasions. I am pleased that the decision of members to refuse planning consent was upheld on both occasions by the Planning Inspectorate.

I have read the committee report and feel that the issues that led to the [previous] committee's decision to refuse consent still apply. Namely:

- 1. The proposed use of the premises as a children's day nursery is not compatible with the prevailing character of the locality which is dominated by single family houses and will result in harm to the amenity of surrounding residential properties by virtue of noise, disturbance and on-street parking generated by such a use. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of policies CF4 and EN5 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 2. The proposed use would lead to increased traffic movements of a form and degree, which would compromise the free flow of traffic on the public highway, which would lead to parking on the rear lane and endanger the safety of road users including pedestrians. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of policy ST3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033.*

I am of the belief that the reasons set out above from the two previous refusals stand true today and that the committee report/applicant hasn't set out any firm evidence that the proposed change of use will not result in harm to amenity of the surrounding residential properties or will not lead to increased traffic movements of a form and degree which would compromise the free flow of traffic on the public highway.

I note that the committee report states that the only mitigating factor to make the application acceptable is simply extending the pedestrian guardrail. I completely disagree.

The extension of the guardrail will merely move the problems from the immediate vicinity of the building but the conflict with traffic flow on a busy main road will still be present and I still believe that this proposed use this will result in harm to amenity of the surrounding residential properties, further down Rowlandson Terrace and Manila Street.

Properties that have not as per the committee report been consulted on the application (but properties across the main road who will not be impacted in the slightest by the proposed use have been consulted).

I respectfully put to you that the concerns that led to the application being refused twice previously have not been satisfactorily met in this submission and request that members for a third time refuse planning consent on the two grounds set out above which in my view still apply.

Having regard to the above comments it is considered that the matters raised have been satisfactorily addressed within the main report and as such it is recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions listed within the main agenda report.