

FAO Gwyn Humphreys  
Wrexham County Borough Council  
Planning & Regulatory Service  
Guildhall  
Wrexham  
LL11 1AY**Sent via email only**

25 October 2023

Dear Gwyn,

**LAND NORTH OF BRYN LANE, WREXHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE – P/2023/0497****APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTEE COMMENTS**

Please find enclosed a response from CBRE Limited, on behalf of Net World Sports (hereafter referred to as the 'Applicant'), in relation to several consultation responses provided to date on application reference P/2023/0497.

The below details each consultee and their comments in turn, along with a response from the Applicant where necessary.

**Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water**

Welsh Water advise that the application site is crossed by a public sewer and recommend that the layout takes account of the existing sewer or diversion of the sewer may be required.

The Applicant's drainage consultant and architect have confirmed that the existing sewer and easement lie outside of any of the proposed units but does cross hardstanding and road infrastructure, as shown in the Illustrative Masterplan. The majority of the sewer is within the outline application part of the hybrid application, where layout has only been shown illustratively at this stage. The detailed design of the units can account for the location of the sewer in future Reserved Matters applications or, if not, the Applicant will seek further discussion with Welsh Water if diversion is sought.

Welsh Water recommend that the Applicant consults with Wrexham County Borough Council (WCBC) as the determining SuDS Approval Body. We are awaiting a response from WCBC Drainage Officers in relation to the application and would welcome a meeting to discuss the application, if required.

For foul water, Welsh Water considers that it is unlikely that sufficient capacity exists in the network to accommodate the proposed development, and recommend the Applicant instructs Welsh Water to undertake a Hydraulic Modelling Assessment (HMA) to examine the impact of the development. The Applicant is currently liaising with Welsh Water regarding the HMA process.

If connection to the existing network is not possible, the Applicant has proposed an on-site treatment solution, which is shown on the submitted plans and is referred to in the submitted technical reports.

Welsh Water have recently been consulted on application reference P/2023/0593, which is currently pending determination, and have requested the below condition wording in relation to a Hydraulic Modelling Assessment:

*No building shall be occupied until a point of connection on the public sewerage system as has been identified by a hydraulic modelling assessment, which shall be first submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Thereafter the connection shall be made in accordance with the recommended connection option following the implementation of any necessary reinforcement works to the sewerage system, as may be identified by the hydraulic modelling assessment.*

*Reason: To prevent hydraulic overloading of the public sewerage system, to protect the health and safety of existing residents and ensure no pollution of or detriment to the environment.*

The Applicant would welcome the agreement of a suitably worded planning condition to address the requirement for a HMA. We would welcome a similar trigger (i.e. prior to occupation) to be attached to a planning condition for Land North of Bryn Lane, to ensure the outcomes of the HMA and proposed drainage strategy are resolved prior to occupation of the development.

We request that planning conditions relating to foul drainage design and surface water drainage are separate planning conditions.

We would welcome a meeting with Welsh Water to discuss, if required.

### **Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust**

Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT) provided a number of comments relating to archaeology requirements. The main points raised by CPAT are:

- Further assessment is sought regarding the sub-surface potential of the application site through a scheme of investigative trial trenching, which is requested pre-determination of the application;
- Consideration should be given to removal of field 5 from the proposal to preserve the ridge and furrow field system earthworks; and
- The implications of the development upon 'Important' hedgerows need to be considered.

We will respond to the concerns of CPAT via a separate letter and accompanying technical note.

### **Public Protection**

WCBC Public Protection has responded on burning of waste, air quality, noise and external lighting. A response in relation to one of the proposed Noise conditions was provided by my colleague Sarah Grady (email dated 21<sup>st</sup> September 2023). We await a response from the Public Protection Officer to confirm any comments on the proposed changes.

### **Contaminated Land**

The Contaminated Land Officer has responded to set out that the reports submitted were, in principle, satisfactory, however there were a number of queries which required clarification.

The Applicant has provided a response via a separate note which was issued on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2023.

### **Tree Officer**

The Tree Officer has objected to the proposed development due to a number of concerns. The Applicant will respond to this separately with a technical note which addresses landscaping specifically.

### **Planning Officer**

A number of comments were received via email on the 10<sup>th</sup> October 2023. The table below reviews each comment and provides the Applicant's response.

| COMMENT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | APPLICANT RESPONSE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I don't believe the upper and lower scale parameters for all of the Outline proposals have been provided. Whilst upper building heights have been provided, this does not confirm the lower limit, and I can't see that upper and lower limits for width, length etc have been provided at all. These will need to be confirmed for all elements forming part of the Outline proposals, including the B-use buildings, and the A1, A3, C1 and Sui Generis uses. Confirmation of these by email or standalone document will suffice. | In terms of minimum and maximum sizes, please see below in relation to the outline part of the hybrid application. The maximum sizes reflect the submitted illustrative masterplan:<br><br><b>Zone A1:</b><br>Minimum length: 20m<br>Minimum width: 10m<br>Minimum height: 10m to ridge |

Maximum length: 75.64m  
Maximum width: 37.82m  
Maximum height: 20m to ridge

**Zone A2:**

Minimum length: 25m  
Minimum width: 12m  
Minimum height: 10m to ridge

Maximum length: 95.5m  
Maximum width: 47.75m  
Max height: 20m to ridge

**Zone B:**

Minimum length: 25m  
Minimum width: 12m  
Minimum height: 10m to ridge

Maximum length: 295.3m  
Maximum width: 147.65m  
Max height: 28.5m to ridge

At present I note that bunding is proposed within areas identified for Environmental Mitigation within the Masterplan forming part of LDP Policy SP10. It is my opinion, although I am yet to receive any formal input from the Ecology Officer and NRW, that the proposed bunds in these locations would prejudice the function of the mitigation/corridor areas.

CBRE requested further detail from the case officer to enable a response on this point to be prepared (email dated 23/10/2023).

Full details of strategic corridors and residential buffers will need to be established at Outline/Full planning application stage, rather than at Reserved Matters stage.

Details of the strategic corridors and buffers are provided on the submitted Parameters Plan (Ref: 22136-SGP-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-111004 Rev. I). This plan could be conditioned as part of any future consent to secure and protect the width and length of the strategic corridor and residential buffer, along with the proposed bunds within these areas.

The submitted Landscape Strategy Overall Overview plan (ref. 22-2630 Rev. V2.2) demonstrates (illustratively) how these corridors/buffers could be planted, which will be developed further for the outline areas at Reserved Matters stage. Further specific information regarding the exact species type and number of plants can be secured via a suitably worded planning condition.

It does not appear that the Residential Buffer area in the north-western corner of the site is consistently a width of at least 50m, as is required by LDP Policies SP10 and EM6.

The residential buffer area is 50m to the east of the residential properties off Hugmore Lane and reduces to 25m at the south of the residential properties.

There are existing mature hedgerows/trees to the south of the southern most residential property on Hugmore Lane that would provide visual mitigation of the scheme to the southern most property and therefore it was considered that the buffer could be

reduced on this elevation to 25m. We have retained a 50m buffer on the eastern edge, which does not have the same level of existing landscaping and is the principal sensitive edge. Bunding will be provided within the residential buffers.

No sequential test in-line with Part 4.3.18 of Planning Policy Wales (Ed. 11) appears to have been undertaken in relation to the proposed A1, A3, C1 and Sui Generis uses. This will be required to help justify the proposed non-B uses on the site, given that these are not allocated within the draft LDP. LDP Policy R6 is also of relevance and I would suggest attention is paid to this also. Whilst LDP Policy EM2 does allow for leisure and food and drink facilities to be provided within employment areas, this does not extend to the C1 and Sui Generis uses proposed. As such, I would suggest a Sequential Test needs to be undertaken and justification needs to be provided in relation to the proposed non-B uses.

The Applicant will respond separately in relation to the Sequential Test requirement.

A justification also needs to be provided as to why land allocated for B-uses should be used for other purposes.

This justification is set out within section 6.1.4 of the submitted Planning Statement. The benefits of the scheme are summarised at Section 7.7 of the Planning Statement.

If you have any further queries or comments in relation to the above, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details provided.

Yours sincerely

**Helen Clarkson**  
**Associate Director – Planning & Development**