

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, WREXHAM ON
MONDAY 6 DECEMBER 2010

MEMBERS

Councillor M.G. Morris, Chair
Councillor Paul H. Pemberton, Vice-Chair

Councillor		I. David Bithell, MBE	Councillor		D.J. Griffiths
"	*	Mrs. Beryl L Blackmore	"		G.W. Griffiths
"		R.W. Caldecott	"		Carrie Harper
"	*	Peter Davies	"	*	Hugh Jones
"	*	Ron Davies	"		Marc Jones
"		R. Mark Davies	"		Howard Moysen
"		Mike Edwards	"	*	Ronnie Prince
"	*	Terry Evans	"		Gwyneth Roberts
"	*	Keith Gregory	"	*	Mrs J.M.B. Roberts

* Absent

Also Present: Councillors T Alan Edwards, R. Alun Jenkins, David Kelly, Barrie Price, Paul Rogers and Phil Wynn.

64 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Peter Davies, Ron Davies, Terry Evans, Keith Gregory, Hugh Jones, Ronnie Prince and Mrs J.M.B. Roberts.

65 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meetings held on 1 November 2010 and 12 November 2010 were submitted.

RESOLVED – That the Minutes of the Meetings held on 1 November 2010 and 12 November 2010 be received and confirmed as a correct record.

66 APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF PROPOSAL TO DEMOLISH 1 – 4 GRENVILLE TERRACE, STATION ROAD, RUABON, WREXHAM

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report (CPLO/48/10 pages 76 – 80) together with a further addendum report in respect of the above-mentioned application.

Charlene Sussums (representing applicant) spoke in support of the application.

The adjoining Local Member (Councillor Barrie Price) commented that there was the likelihood that bats could be present within the buildings and requested that, prior to any demolition work, a bat survey should be undertaken and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

During consideration of the application several Members commented that the Local Planning Authority should be satisfied that there were no protected species on site prior to the approval of demolition details. Therefore, they recommended that, in order to protect wildlife interests which are afforded special protection, further consideration of the application be

deferred pending the submission of a survey to the Local Planning Authority to ensure that bats or other protected species were not present on site. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED – That consideration of the application be deferred to enable the applicant time to submit a survey to ensure that bats or other protected species were not present on site.

67 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report (CPL0/48/10) for Members' consideration of planning applications and attention was drawn to his addendum report where relevant.

APPLICATION NO: P/2005/1486	LOCATION: Land at Former Brymbo Steel Works Brymbo Wrexham LL11 5BT	DATE RECEIVED: 23/12/2005
COMMUNITY: Brymbo	DESCRIPTION: Outline Applicatino for Residential Development	CASE OFFICER: MP
WARD: Brymbo	APPLICANT(S) NAME: Brymbo Developments Ltd	AGENT NAME: Parkhill Estates Ltd M Ferguson

The Local Member (Councillor Paul Rogers) indicated his support for the application as both this development and the retail application P/2009/0939 (to be determined later on in the Agenda) were intended as enabling development to generate the necessary funds to complete the Spine Road linking Tanyfron and Brymbo. Furthermore, any outstanding funds would be used exclusively to fund the development of the Brymbo Heritage Area. In his opinion, failure to complete the Spine Road would have a far reaching and detrimental impact preventing the full implementation of a major ten year reclamation project.

During consideration of the application, some Members concurred with the views expressed by the Local Member.

Several Members indicated their objection to the application as the proposed development was outside the settlement limit and within a Green Barrier. Furthermore, in their opinion, the scale and location of the development would be over intensive for the site and would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Therefore, they recommended that permission be refused.

In response to a question from the Local Member (Councillor Paul Rogers) on the status of the planning resolution to grant permission in 2006 (P/2005/1486), the Chief Planning Officer explained that as the resolution to grant permission was conditional on the completion of a Section 106 Agreement no permission had in fact been issued as the Agreement had not been finalised. Therefore if the Committee decided to refuse permission no further action would be taken in respect of any previous Section 106 Agreement.

After hearing the views of Members, it was:-

RESOLVED - That permission be REFUSED.

Reason

The site lies outside a settlement limit and within a green barrier as defined by the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan where there is a presumption against any new residential development. In this regard, the proposed development represents a departure from the plan and is contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies PS1, EC1 and H5

APPLICATION NO: P/2009/0939	LOCATION: Land adjacent to Phoenix Drive Brymbo Wrexham LL11 5BT	DATE RECEIVED: 17/11/2009
COMMUNITY: Brymbo	DESCRIPTION: Outline Application for Erection of Supermarket and Small Retail Units and Associated Car Parking	CASE OFFICER: SJG
WARD: Brymbo	APPLICANT(S) NAME: Mr M Ferguson Brymbo Developments Ltd	AGENT NAME: Parkhill Estates Ltd Mr M Ferguson

The Chief Planning Officer commented that this application was linked to Application Code No. P/2005/1486 as the retail proposal was required to supplement the land value generated from the previous application to cover the cost of the Spine Road. Furthermore, without the linkage to the previous application, the retail development would also be premature in terms of the emerging Local Development Plan which can only be given limited weight given the relatively early stage in its preparation. Therefore, in light of the previous application being refused, he recommended that this application be refused.

RESOLVED - That permission be REFUSED.

Reason

The proposed development is a departure from the provisions of the adopted Unitary Development Plan in respect of its scale and location. To allow the development would be contrary to UDP policies S4 and S6. The retail development would also be premature in terms of the emerging LDP which can only be given limited weight given the relatively early stage in its preparation.