

Susan Davies

From: Sharon Holman
Sent: 30 April 2019 08:21
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: P/2019/0141 Station Avenue, Chirk

Civ – flood officer resp

From: Neil Taunt
Sent: 29 April 2019 14:31
To: Sharon Holman
Subject: RE: P/2019/0141 Station Avenue, Chirk

Hi Sharon,

Sorry for the delay in getting a response back to you.

The response below makes reference to a detailed drainage design is currently underway. In my absence I have been approached by Alan Kane working on behalf of the developer but have not had sight of any proposed plans or discussions around what is required. In relation to the submitted detail in your email, the change of underground storage to a surface feature is a step in the right direction, but it would appear that this will act as an end of pipe system that would not deliver the compliance with other standards as required by the Welsh ministers legislation. There are obvious features that could be included within the site that would deliver water quality and future management and maintenance benefits but these may require modification to the site layout to accommodate. I will await further contact from the applicants representative to discuss these further.

Many thanks
Neil

From: Steve Jones [mailto:dsjonesandco@live.co.uk]
Sent: 05 April 2019 13:28
To: Sharon Holman
Cc: Neil Edwards; sandra@edwardshomes.co.uk
Subject: FW: P/2019/0141 Station Avenue, Chirk

Hi Sharon,

Thank you for your comprehensive email below. I note what you say but don't necessarily agree with all of the points made and set out my own thoughts in red below. I have also attached a copy of your later email with Pete's comments and have made my own comments in red for your consideration.

I trust that this is in order and look forward to hearing from you. If you feel that we might need to meet to resolve any outstanding issues please let me have a couple of dates over the next working week?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks in anticipation and best regards,

Steve

Steve Jones
D. S. Jones & CO.

T: 01978 750195
M: 07880 874522

DSJonesandCo@live.co.uk

26, Prospect Drive, Coedpoeth, Wrexham, LL11 3PE.

From: Sharon Holman <Sharon.Holman@wrexham.gov.uk>

Sent: 29 March 2019 13:12

To: dsjonesandco@live.co.uk

Subject: P/2019/0141 Station Avenue, Chirk

Dear Steve,

Please see below comments, as promised.

Site Layout

The proposed site layout has altered since Outline planning permission was Granted. The key changes are the introduction of additional dwellings and the omission of semi-detached house types. The main first principles of the approved illustrative layout have been adopted in the preparation of the current layout - central access, strong street scenes to Station Avenue and to views from the east. My client is seeking 2 additional dwellings but this only takes the density of development to 22.6/Ha or 9.1/acre. I don't understand why it is important to retain an element of semi-detached house types and don't see this as a valid planning matter.

As a result of the latter, the layout appears too uniform and there is now a greater amount of frontage parking. This is particularly detrimental upon the main approach into the site, which was previously met with planting in the foreground, and in views across to the development from the playing fields. Whilst I have no objections to reducing the number of semi-detached house types, a certain number should still remain in order to provide variation in the building line and reduce frontage parking in key locations. I fail to see why the proposed arrangement of dwellings facing Station Avenue is detrimental. The approved illustrative layout provided six dwellings in this location all with frontage parking spaces of one space per dwelling which incidentally does not meet your parking guidelines. The submitted site layout shows frontage parking to all plots in this location which matches the approved site plan and by necessity provides at least one additional space per dwelling. It also shows green spaces between the parking spaces which will each be occupied a standard specimen tree - 5No. trees to this street scene as opposed to the 6No. previously approved. I fail to see how the loss of one tree could be deemed detrimental to this aspect. With regard to the west facing street scene, we propose frontage parking to 4 plots - the same as the approved layout. Driveways to the side of dwellings are provided to 9 dwellings in order to lessen the impact of parked cars. Again, I would mention that the approved layout indicates parking spaces only large enough to accommodate 1 car to most plots - the current layout overcomes this shortfall. Additionally, the front gardens to plots 17 to 22 are significantly deeper than indicated on the approved site plan and this will provide more potential for planting. The proposed soft landscaped areas to the frontages of all plots facing to the east on the approved plan are all extremely limited and I would suggest that the potential for vertical planting is greater in the current proposals. With regard to uniformity, the approved layout is also rather uniform apart from the swept building line to plots 4 to 6 and I don't see this as a negative factor. All spatial separation standards and amenity areas are achieved and the proportions of the site which dictates single sided development, leads itself to the form of layout proposed which is not significantly different from the approved site layout.

The previous proposals also offered a more interesting and organic layout at the entrance plots 1-6. This group is particularly important, acting as the primary interface between the development and the Conservation Area. The swept building line which followed the curve of the access road should be reintroduced. The swept building line which you refer to would have the effect of creating a disjointed street scene that would lack the strength of the currently submitted scheme. I have provided an actual street scene to show how the proposed dwellings will look and would argue that the submitted arrangement provides an interesting and appropriate street scene which is worthy of support.

The location of the foul water pumping station, associated infrastructure and presumably an enclosure will have a detrimental visual impact upon a key area of open space to the site frontage, and should be relocated to an alternative discreet location. Unfortunately the previous outline application did not address drainage issues and so you could not have appreciated that a pumped system would be required in order to deal with foul effluent. Welsh Water's requirements for access for maintenance vehicles means that it would not be possible to site the equipment to the rear of the site within the resident's open space. I did consider this but it would have required an extensive, hard surfaced access road and turning area which would have been detrimental to the open space. The current proposals mean that the adoptable turning head between plots 8 and 14 will provide turning space so that maintenance vehicles can easily access the equipment which is mostly buried. It would be possible to move the pumping station in a south easterly direction by a few metres but I would suggest that the south eastern corner of the site is the only appropriate location.

I have no objections to the house types proposed but the number of different roof tiles specified should be reduced. To avoid too much contrast, grey and dark red only should be proposed. Noted. The Warwick house type which was previously annotated with Moss Borough red roofing tiles has been amended to show Old English Dark Red as per the Lingfield house type.

In relation to boundary treatments, those boundaries which are most prominent should be of a better quality construction. A brick built boundary should be proposed to the east facing boundary to the garden of number 6. Similarly the northern boundary to the garden of number 8 and the south and west elevations to number 14 should also be walled. Furthermore, a curved boundary to the garden of number 14 is required to reduce its oppressiveness for the occupants of number 13. Noted. An amended site layout plan is attached.

Trees

Whilst the site access is in accordance with that as agreed at outline, details of the previously agreed mitigation for the loss of the two protected trees should be submitted in support of this application. Noted. The submitted site layout plan has been annotated with a replacement tree and the attached amended site plan reflects this.

The application is accompanied by the same arboricultural report submitted for outline. The trees within this report were actually inspected in 2015 consequently, the findings are now out of date and an up to date report is required in support of this application. The submitted arboricultural report has been novated for the benefit of my client and it was updated on the 20th of February 2017. I would suggest that it is not out of date and would urge you to allow it to be used as part of the consideration of this application.

The 3.0m buffer zone for the existing hedgerow to the eastern boundary has been omitted from this layout design and the introduction of the 1.2m wide service verge compromises both the physical integrity of the hedge and associated wildlife habitat. The 3.0m buffer / exclusion zone should be re-instated to afford appropriate protection with the access road adjusted further west

and away from the hedge. The grassed verge indicated to the east of the estate road is arbitrary and will not contain services or require an edging to be installed. I have indicated dimensions at various locations to show that the eastern kerb line which is the last line of development, is always a minimum of 3 metres away from the boundary hedge.

The 2.0m footpath providing connectivity through the hedgerow to the existing POS to the east is to be constructed to a no-dig specification in accordance with BS5837:2012 to avoid root and soil damage which may be detrimental to the hedgerow. **Noted. A relevant note has been added to the attached site plan.**

The SUDS scheme would be better incorporated as an above-ground landscape feature within the POS to the north rather than the proposed below-ground Aquacell system which by its installation, location and maintenance requirements may restrict planting and landscaping potential. Due to the benefits to screening from Kronospan and improvements to air quality it is essential that the POS is planted and landscaped to its full potential. **Noted. The surface water drainage strategy indicated on the submitted plan has been amended to show an above ground swale in order to deal with the infiltration of surface water. The levels on site will allow this to be formed quite naturally and the proposal to discharge surface water in this way has been reported to my client's drainage engineer, Alan Kane of Kane Design Ltd who is in the process of preparing designs and applications for SAB and Welsh Water approvals.**

Ecology

This proposed layout compromises the existing green infrastructure on site and limits the effective space for new planting to soften and mitigate the development. The hedge on the eastern side has been recognised as being of high ecological value, however the submitted layout does not correspond with that shown in the tree report. It is clear there are points along the hedge where the new layout will impinge on the 3-4m protection zone. The spine road should be moved to the west and the service strip moved to the opposite side of the road, with the pinch point at the north of the site re-designed. There is also a general lack of space within the development for green infrastructure planting which could be resolved through a lower density of development. **As mentioned above, we are proposing to provide a 3 metre wide corridor for almost the entire length of the eastern boundary. The pinch point you refer to reflects the approved site plan which also shows a "pinch point" of around 1.5 metres at the northern end of the site. I assumed that this was acceptable.**

Drainage

No formal application for SAB approval or request for pre-application SAB advice has been received to date. In the absence of the full consideration of the requirements of the National Standards for SuDS, and requirements of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act, it has not been demonstrated that a compliant sustainable surface water management scheme can be delivered for the site.

It is likely that this requirement will have implications for the proposed development, particularly in relation to the layout. In some instances it may not be possible to identify a scheme that can successfully comply with the national standards, particularly if future maintenance, management and funding of a scheme cannot be agreed with the SAB as adopting authority.

Prior to the determination of the application full consideration to the implications that compliance to the National SuDS standards will have for the development and to the revision of the proposals accordingly is required. **Amended site plan attached reflects this advice. Detailed drainage design is currently underway as mentioned above.**

The information submitted with the application indicates infiltration techniques will be used to manage surface waters. The requirements for SAB approval were brought to the applicant's attention via the pre application consultation process. It would appear the applicant wishes to deal with the SAB approval process as a matter of detailed design should the application be successful. The indicative drainage design suggests a traditional piped system leading to an underground crate infiltration system – this is unlikely to be acceptable to the SAB. When full consideration is given to the now mandatory SuDS standards it is highly likely that this will have implications for site layout and should be given full consideration at the earliest possible stage.

If no additional information is submitted prior to determination, the application cannot be supported as it has not been demonstrated that surface water can be sustainably managed over the lifetime of the development.

Kind regards
Sharon

Sharon Holman



Development Control Planning Officer/ Swyddog Cynllunio Rheoli Datblygu



01978 298779



Wrexham County Borough Council, 16 Lord Street, Wrexham,
LL11 1LG



Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Wrecsam, 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

Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn ymateb i unrhyw ohebiaeth yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd hyn yn arwain at unrhyw oedi.

Ewch i weld - mi fedrwch chi dalu, rhoi gwybod, gwneud cais, dweud eich dweud, a dod o hyd i wybodaeth ar-lein yn www.wrecsam.gov.uk. Arbedwch bapur - meddylwch cyn argraffu!

Mae'r neges e-bost hon ac unrhyw atodiadau wedi eu bwriadu ar gyfer yr unigolyn neu'r sefydliad y?i cyfeirir atynt yn unig. Am yr amodau llawn yngl?n ? chynnwys a defnyddio?r neges e-bost hon, ac unrhyw atodiadau, cyfeiriwch at www.wrecsam.gov.uk/top_navigation/disclaimersw.htm

We welcome correspondence in Welsh. We will respond to any correspondence in Welsh and this will not lead to any delay.

Take a look - you can pay, report, request, have your say and find information online at www.wrexham.gov.uk. Save paper - think before you print!

This e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. For full conditions in relation to content and use of this e-mail message and any attachments, please refer to www.wrexham.gov.uk/top_navigation/disclaimers.htm

