

from

Mr.P Main

34 Park Street,

Rhosddu,
WREXHAM
LL11 2NN

15th February 2019

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal at 33 Park Street Wrexham LL11 2NN.

Dear Sir,

I am against the appeal proposals'

As a Neighbouring occupier of the above Property this is my representation to the Appeal.

The back yard of number 33 measures 24.09 m², Mr Shield makes mention in his appeal to the fact that "the Council Planning officer has recommended the approval and advised the committee that the rear yard was OK for bins and amenities, and that the Council guidance note states that where existing dwellings are to be converted into HMOs then it is likely that they will already have curtilage that will adequately fulfil this function." However the guidance for this published by the Council says that there should be 30m² plus 2m² for each occupying person more than 7. As Mr Shields is wanting a license for 8 occupants that would require a space of 32 m², which is far greater than the space available. There is a small front garden right on the street, however this does not seem to fall into the requirement specified as an enclosed private space.

With regards to the parking. In his appeal he quotes a council survey that shows that a C4 HMO with 6 bedrooms and 6 tenants has 4 cars. and that the maximum C4 demand is therefore 1 space for every 1.5 bedroom/bed space. He also states that the "Planning officer said that in his view a 5 bed unit would not generally require more parking than the existing and in many cases would require less." I would contest the validity of his claims which are not proven to be accurate. Park Street is woefully overcrowded with vehicles and the bad parking of some of the residents has caused severe difficulties when emergency vehicles require access. To change the existing 4 bedroom family home to a five bedroom property for 8 individuals will create a greater strain and does not comply with the Planning Regulations regarding Parking. I also note that the Highways Department also recommended that this approval should not go ahead on these grounds.

In his Appeal Mr. Shield makes reference to the fact that the Planning Officer has said that various

things are "not a Problem," I was under the impression that a Planning Application is decided upon by the Council Planning Committee and not by an Individual Officer.

The work to alter the property has almost been completed by the Applicant, despite no Official Approval, and the detailed plans submitted to the Council in the Planning Application have not been adhered to, insomuch as the interior layout has been changed quite considerably.

Furthermore the Sewage outlet from the Property has been altered and there is now provision for 4 sewage outlets when previously there was only one. This will put a lot more pressure on an already ancient drainage system that has had problems recently. I was under the impression that such a change required Building Regulations Approval.

I feel that the Applicant has forged ahead without proper permission, whereas most folk would await the Grant of a Planning Permission, otherwise it makes a mockery of the whole system and gives a decidedly wrong view of the democracy of the Council. Unless of course there has been some sort of "Gentleman's agreement" that such permission will be granted! I feel that the Council Committee's decision to refuse Planning, which was unanimous save for one abstention, should be upheld.

Yours sincerely,

Mr P A Main.