

WREXHAM COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF 7th MARCH 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>
<i>25-38</i>	<i>Gresford</i>	<i>P/2022/0035</i>	√	
<i>51-54</i>	<i>Rhosddu</i>	<i>P/2022/0072</i>		√

Pages 25-38 **Gresford** **P/2022/0035**
5 Oak Drive, Marford, Wrexham

SPEAKER – AGAINST – Sue Lane (Neighbour)

Pages 51-54 **Rhosddu** **P/2022/0072**
27 Clarence Road, Wrexham, LL11 2EU

SPEAKER – FOR – Mr Bithell (Applicant)

ADDENDUM

PAGES 25-38

P/2022/0035

5 OAK DRIVE MARFORD WREXHAM LL12 8XT
TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF HOUSE. NEW
STORE TO GARDEN

Consultations

Representations

Additional objections received:

1. The photo shows the whole of the open part of the boundary between No.3 Oak drive and No.5 and part of their gable wall. This side of the garden of No. 3 is the most-open boundary of the garden.
2. The houses are not detached but linked into a terrace and the 2m separation distance is not met.
3. No detail has been provided in the report of the effects on No.3 despite them being explained in the objection letters submitted.
4. Concerned that no one in the decision-making process has made a site visit to view No.3 as a whole when considering the impact of these plans, especially as there are no mitigation opportunities to counter loss of light and/ or overbearing effects.
5. The report should also refer to the impact on 5 Willow Drive. Concern that this property will be massively overlooked compared to the current situation.
6. Although the "Garden Store" may be close to permitted development rules, it should not be allowed to be against the fence as the site plan implies. Even a separation of 1m would make it far less imposing.
7. There is concern that the store building will be used as a summer house with a bar installed.
8. The store building will range in height from 2.1m to 2.6m and be located adjacent to a 1.7m high fence for No. 5 Willow Drive.
9. The structure will be an eyesore that will dominate outlook from the back of the adjoining house.
10. Questions asked about why the shed has to be so big and located against the fence. A minimum 1m (preferably 2) boundary separation should be enforced.
11. Concern that the distance between neighbours at No.5 Willow Drive is under 22m and therefore privacy will be unacceptably impacted.

Applicant's Submission

Observations

The proposal has been amended since submission to reduce the impact on neighbours to a point where officers are of the view refusal could not be sustained at appeal. This is because of the angle of the properties to each other notably No. 5 Willow Drive and the application property.

Regarding the height of the garden building, the maximum height of this building is 2.6m. This is 0.1m more than is already allowed in this position under permitted

development rights. If the building were moved 2.0m away from the boundary, the height could rise to 3.0m if mono-pitch or 4.0m if dual pitch.

Recommendation

No change