

AnnS Jones

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 19 June 2018 12:55
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: P/2018/0478 - High Street Ruabon

Ecology Officer comments

From: Emma Broad
Sent: 19 June 2018 11:58
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: RE: P/2018/0478 - High Street Ruabon

I'm Ok with the proposed methods, i.e. demolition without a NWR licence with an ecologist providing tool box talk and supervision should it be required. In terms of mitigation I would expect 2 integral bat boxes similar to an Ibstock type C in the warmest location. I would suggest on the end south facing gable of the detached property and to the rear of the semi detracted. Im happy to condition the exact type and placement but it would be in the applicants interest to get it agreed as part of this permission.

Emma

Emma Broad

Ecology and Biodiversity Officer | Swyddog Ecoleg a Bioamrywiaeth



01978 298762 or 07966929629



Planning Services, Community Wellbeing & Development, 16 Lord Street, Wrexham, LL11 1LG



Adran Cynllunio, Pennaeth Adran Lles Cymuned a Datblygiad, 16 Stryt yr Arglwydd,
Wrecsam, LL11 1LG



wrexham.gov.uk | wrecsam.gov.uk



twitter.com/wrexhamcbc | twitter.com/cbswrecsam



facebook.com/wrexhamcouncil | facebook.com/cyngorwrecsam

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 14 June 2018 13:03
To: 'matt@d2architects.co.uk'
Cc: 'Luke@d2architects.co.uk'; Emma Broad
Subject: P/2018/0478 - High Street Ruabon

Matthew,

The plans submitted with the above application are not the most recent versions. I received revision D copies of all plans from your colleague Luke on 19 of January when the previous application was still live. In terms of the elevation and floor plans I cant see any noticeable differences between Revision D and the Revision C plans submitted with the current application.

One plan that is different is the Revision D version of the site plan – copy attached which included a revised (and much better) access layout to address Highways comments. In addition we also received a boundary treatment plan, copy also attached. Is there any reason why neither of these more up to date drawings were submitted?

Our ecologist won't have had chance to view the ecology report as yet, so I have no comments to feedback in terms of whether the mitigation measures proposed are adequate. However, I have had a brief look through the ecology report and there are a couple of issues:

- i) The document is a draft, therefore I am not sure whether we can rely on it.
- ii) The document has been prepared with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore as if the site were in England, which it isn't. NPPF is therefore irrelevant. The ecologist should be looking at PPW and TAN5.
- iii) The elevation plans submitted to accompany the application need to take account of the recommendations made by the ecologist and show where the bat boxes are going to be along with providing the specification for them.

I will relay Emma's comments to you once I have them if there is anything in addition to the above that needs auctioning. I will also need you to formally submit the later version of the site plan and the boundary treatment plan.

Regards

Matthew Phillips

Planning Control Lead/Arweinydd Rheoli Cynllunio
Environment and Planning/Amgylchedd a Chynllunio
Wrexham County Borough Council/Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam
Telephone/Ffôn: 01978 298780