

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 5th December 2022

REPORT OF THE CHIEF OFFICER PLANNING AND REGULATORY
ADDENDUM REPORT

This report summarises information received since the Agenda was compiled including, as appropriate, suggested amendments to recommendations in the light of that information. It also lists those people wishing to address the Committee.

Where the Council has received a request to address the Committee, the applications concerned will be considered first in the order indicated in the table below. The remaining applications will then be considered in the order shown on the original agenda unless indicated by the Chair.

ITEM 4 – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

<i>Page Nos</i>	<i>Community</i>	<i>Planning Ref</i>	<i>Speaker Against</i>	<i>Speaker For</i>
39-48	Bronington	P/2022/0496	✓	
49-53	Gwersyllt	P/2022/0778		✓
55-63	Acton	P/2022/0944	✓	✓

Pages 38-48 **Bronington** **P/2022/0496**

Glebe Farm Bronington

SPEAKER – AGAINST Robert Nicholson

Pages 49-53 **Gwersyllt** **P/2022/0778**

Unit 6 Dodds Lane Gwersyllt, Wrexham

SPEAKER – FOR Stacey Pester – Pegasus Group

Pages 55-63 **Acton** **P/2022/0944**

36 Chester Road Wrexham

SPEAKER – FOR Julie Francis – Chief Housing Officer

SPEAKER – AGAINST Mr Anthony Newnes

Pages

25-31

Code Number

P/2021/1002

Applicant's Submission

The applicant would prefer that permission is granted without the need for make post-decision submissions. They have therefore agreed to a suggestion by Officers that the recommendation should be amended to seek delegated authority to grant permission upon the submission of an Attendance Management Plan

Recommendation

The Chief Officer be given delegated authority to GRANT planning permission subject to:

- the submission of an Attendance Management Plan (AMP);
- consultation with the Highways Officer regarding the AMP; and
- condition 3 being amended to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved AMP.

Pages

13-24

Code Number

P/2021/0967

Observations**Correction to paragraph on page 18:**

*Notwithstanding the changes to the way courses are delivered in light of the Active Learning Framework, it remains possible that both staff and student numbers could increase over time and therefore so too could the levels of vehicular traffic travelling to and from the site using the Crispin Lane/Mold Road junction. Notwithstanding this, the latest demolition plan indicates that the redevelopment scheme will actually result in a net **decrease** of useable floorspace at the University and this is highly material to the application before Members.*

Correction to the Conclusion:

*Given the manner in which the University is operating, combined with the net **decrease** in floorspace arising from the campus redevelopment scheme, Officers are satisfied that the originally approved development will not result in a material increase in the levels of vehicular traffic using the Crispin Lane/Mold Road junction. On this basis, it is recommended that the condition requiring improvements to this highway junction can be removed and replaced by a condition that secures the implementation of the approved demolition plan.*

Pages

55-63

Code Number

P/2022/0944

Consultations

Public Protection Officer

Confirmed they have no comments.

Representations

20 further objections received expressing the following concerns:

- Change to the character of an area;
- Accommodating homeless people in the middle of private houses is not a good idea;
- No outside facilities;
- Too close to adjacent boundaries.
- Fire escape overlooks properties;
- Property is too small for 19 people alongside support staff and visitors;
- Over concentration of facilities for the homeless in the ward;
- Over concentration of facility for the homeless so close to the city centre – potential for a negative impact on economic development.
- The size of rooms mean residents have to congregate outside;
- The building is unsuitable;
- The hostel is attracting people into the area who would not normally be in the neighbourhood;
- Residents congregating outside smoking and drinking;
- Noise;
- Foul language;
- Verbal abuse;
- Drug taking and selling;
- drinking;
- Anti-social behaviour;
- Littering;
- Increase in crime;
- Risk of fraud;
- Found stolen bicycles in the area and motorbike dumped in Groves School;
- Supermarket trolley dumped in the road;
- Graffiti on the electric box new to the Groves School fence;
- Groups walking up and down the road;
- Issues of trespass;
- People knocking on doors asking for money;
- Stress and worry for local residents;
- There have been no additional police patrols;
- Unsuitable in a residential area;
- Light pollution;
- Increase in car traffic;
- Police visits;
- Deterioration in the façade of the building;

- Paper from Housing is inaccurate/is a misrepresentation. An FOI request states that between November and October 2021 there were 33 reports recording and the Police arrived at the hostel 9 times. For the November 2021 to October 2022 there were 32 reports recorded and the police arrived 17 times;
- There has been upgrading work at the hostel;
- Hostel is in the wrong place;
- Ty Nos has yet to be developed – the Council are not interested in sorting this;
- Impact on the value of property;
- Council's well being and improvement priorities are to ensure everyone is safe, improve the environment and promote good health and well-being;
- Temporary permission should be granted for a further 12 months with conditions attached until the merits of the scheme have been proved to be greater than the cons. This process should be conducted by an independent body;
- Reference to representations presented on 5th January 2022 regarding case law (West Midlands Probation Committee v Secretary of State for Environment & Anor) in respect of a proposal for the extension of bail and probation hostel;
- Conditions should be imposed on the planning permission:
 1. A full assessment of the pros and cons of giving planning permission for a homeless shelter in this area of Wrexham, as opposed to suitable alternative locations, which also need to be investigated as part of the assessment;
 2. The views of both the local residents and those of the current occupants of the shelter should be sought through consultations; the design of any questionnaire should receive the approval of the local residents before being circulated, (so leading questionnaires can be avoided) and the findings made public on the siting of the shelter where it currently is;
 3. Presentation of the full investigations into alternative facilities should be made available to the local residents' group.
 4. In the meantime, minuted monthly meetings with local residents should continue and these should not be limited to a restricted no. of residents as currently (no more than local neighbours are allowed to attend each meeting at the moment), as this is limiting the ability of people to express their views and share their concerns;
 5. Actions to deal with local residents' concerns should continue to receive prompt attention by the homeless shelter management team;
 6. Consideration should be taken of the not inconsiderable stress and fear that this development is causing local residents and the impact it has had on people's health and wellbeing. It is understood that this is a material matter that must be taken into account during the assessment of the planning merits of this proposed development and the scale of this trepidation be accepted as being very real.

Observations

The majority of matters are dealt with in the main report.

Impact upon the value of nearby property is not a material planning consideration.

In respect of the case law referred to by objectors, the circumstances would appear to be somewhat different. The site subject to the case law was used for a different purpose (bail hostel) and the proposals were for an extension to that facility. The

proposal was therefore not directly comparable to the one subject to this application. Furthermore the judgement will have taken into account specific matters relevant to the case.

Objectors have not provided any substantive or objective evidence to demonstrate that the matters of concerns are directly related to the operation of the homeless hostel. A number of objectors have commented on an apparent discrepancy between the Operational Supporting Statement and details provided by the Police in a Freedom of Information (FOI) request. However the data provided in the FOI response does not identify who contacted the Police or what the call was about.

The details provided by the Police in the FOI response confirms the figures include the times hostel staff have contacted the police for assistance or advice. Police may attend a property on multiple occasions to deal with one particular issue, for example in response to a call about missing persons. Each visit would be recorded separately. The incidents recorded also include occasions where occupants of the homeless shelter have been the victims of crime. The total number of incidents/events is therefore not a true indicator of risk or demand at a particular location. Members are also reminded that the Police have not objected to the application.

One objector has requested conditions be imposed should planning permission be granted. None of the conditions proposed satisfy the 6 tests set out in Circular 16/2014: The Use of Conditions for Development Management Decision.

Recommendation

Unchanged