

3rd October 2017

Wrexham Planning Department
(Or To Whomever it may concern)
The Guildhall
Wrexham
LL11 1AY

BluSky Developments Ltd
4 Willow Court
Acrefair
Wrexham
LL14 3UJ

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref: 61 Regent Street, Wrexham

I am writing to advise of our disappointment at some of the planning committee's behaviour and attitude during the meeting of 2nd October, as well as that of the local councillor who opposed the planning application of 61 Regent Street.

Regrettably, I was not able to attend and my colleague who was going to speak on our behalf was held up elsewhere, so please accept our apologies for not being present. I did however, manage to watch proceedings via the Wrexham Council weblink.

I would like to temper my words by saying that we fully respect the outcome of the planning committee and ultimately, we are not questioning in the integrity of the vote in any way shape or form. However, I feel it necessary to raise the following;

Local councillor Phil Wynn brought up a number of points that were completely irrelevant, mainly regarding conversation which were correctly dismissed by the planning officer. He also brought up the issue of anti-social behaviour associated with tenants that reside in HMO accommodation, suggesting they would "have barbeques in the street" and "set-up deck chairs" on a main arterial route in to town. (Apologies if I have paraphrased there). We feel that these comments are completely out of context and are a slight on those people unable to afford other accommodation. When the planning officer again pointed out that planning conditions would prevent the front of house being used for recreational purposes, we had assumed that these fears had been alleviated.

However Phil Wynn was afforded a second opportunity to speak, against the policies of the planning meeting. We were of the understanding you had one opportunity to speak but he was granted two? Irrespective of the ethics of being allowed to speak twice, his second concern related to the lack of amenity space for the people living at 61 Regent Street. He suggested that people living at the property needed ample external space and that people living in a HMO

shouldn't be treated like second class citizens – the same “type” of person that was 5 minutes earlier having a barbeque in the street and causing anti-social behaviour. I find it somewhat bizarre that in the two visits to the stand, Mr Wynn could both defend the rights of HMO tenants as well as accuse them of causing anti-social behaviour? We feel the second visit to the stand probably swayed the opinion of the committee in to believing that HMO tenants are disruptive, anti-social nuisances that should be kept away from mainstream society.

On the topic of external amenity space for HMO properties, we feel that a precedent has been set on other properties in the town, which makes it unfair to levy that excuse against our proposal. If inadequate parking and/or external seating space is an issue for 61 Regent Street, a number of HMO's across the county must be failing to comply with standards?

We had fully complied with the requests of the planning department and were looking forward to working with the local stakeholders to enhance the external appearance of Regent Street as well as making use of a derelict building (*we noted the comments suggesting our Design and Access statement was incorrect by saying the building was derelict. It is in occupation to a minimal extent, with 1 man occasionally working out of the office as he is approaching retirement. Regular deliveries to the properties as suggested by Joanne Kinch is a complete fallacy.) We had assumed that any anti-social behaviour linked to our proposal would be dealt with by revoking our license or dealing with the local community police and PCSO's, not by refusal of a planning application.

As mentioned at the start of my letter, I would like to reiterate our position that we fully respect the vote but will consider our options to appeal as the result clearly has an undertone of prejudice and personal opinion. It is a shame that personal opinion has obscured fact in this case, but we hope to work together with the authority in the not too distant future.

Yours faithfully

Mark Wilkins

Mark Wilkins
BluSky Developments Ltd