

Matthew Phillips

From: Lisa Vaughan
Sent: 15 September 2023 16:39
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: FW: Stansty Development - Updated Response for Matthew
Attachments: 5_UPDATEDStansty 2019-0923-Planning Version.xlsx

Hi Matthew,

Please see responses below in regards to your queries. I have also attached a new spreadsheet containing the amendments agreed.

If you need any more information please let me know.

Many thanks

Lisa

Enquiry from Matthew:-

Emily,

I have reviewed your response to the above.

If you may recall I sent over a response from the applicants questioning some aspects of the response. However there are a couple of matters that I have some concerns about and have highlighted on the attached.

- In terms of the cumulative impact of other developments on primary capacity, we can't take into account P/2021/0094. This development is subject to its own Planning Obligation (via P/2018/0671) to secure primary contributions. The impact of that development is therefore mitigated by that S106 agreement. Including it on the attached is therefore double counting. We didn't count the 20 pupils in the calculations that table was listed for reference as not sure that all pupils generated from that development will attend the school mentioned in 106
- I don't think it would be appropriate to include P/2023/0050 on the primary or secondary school lists because the application hasn't yet been determined and is some way off being determined. Noted as a comment on the spreadsheet that Education requested the large and small Stansty developments to be considered together as they are on adjacent sites.
- Additionally, I do have some concern about including P/2021/1057 in the list for secondary. The application is also undetermined, however if you are asking for contributions for that application as well, then the impact of that development will be mitigated via the s106 if permission is granted. Either way it should be omitted from the list. Done – removed the 11 pupils – agree with planning
- Whilst P/2019/0354 and P/2020/0649 are also in the list but undetermined, these two application are different in my opinion, both having results to grant pending S106 agreements being completed. Kept on the spreadsheet
- The calculation of the impact on additional pupils on the 3 secondary schools assumes that 245 additional pupils would go to all 3 schools, which cannot be the case. For example, if 245 additional pupils all went to Bryn Alyn, then there'd be no increase in demand for the other 2 schools. Would there not be a split in

terms of x% going to English Medium, Welsh Medium and Faith? New total 234 (taking off the 11 pupils from Llay New Road) not included numbers for faith or Welsh as project identified is Ysgol Bryn Alyn an English Medium Secondary School.

- Finally, Ysgol Bryn Alyn has 5 S106 agreements already. We therefore cannot require further contributions towards the school generically. You would need to identify a specific project to increase capacity at the school that the development could contribute towards. Alternatively, the Education Department would have to object to the development and be prepared to defend any subsequent appeal. **Project has been identified and noted on the spreadsheet**

Regards

Cofion / Regards
Donna

Donna Tait
Uwch Swyddog Mynediad a Lleoedd Ysgolion/Access and School Places Senior Officer



 Addysg ac Ymyrraeth Gynnar, Adeiladau'r Goron, 31 Stryt Caer, Wreccsam LL13 8BG
- (01978) 295667 Ext 5667

 Education and Early Intervention, Crown Buildings, 31 Chester Street, Wrexham LL13 8BG -
(01978) 295667 Ext 5667

 wrexham.gov.uk | wreccsam.gov.uk